

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 85-864
H. R. 13247

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 13247.....	1
Digest of Public Law 85-864.....	2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 13247

- May 22, 1958 Rep. Elliott introduced H. R. 12630 which was referred to House Education and Labor Committee. Print of bill.
- July 1, 1958 Rep. Elliott introduced H. R. 13247 which was referred to House Education and Labor Committee. Print of bill.
- July 2, 1958 House committee ordered H. R. 13247 reported in lieu of H. R. 12630.
- July 15, 1958 House committee reported H. R. 13247 without amendment. Print of bill and House Report No. 2157.
- Aug. 5, 1958 Rep. Feelinghuysen inserted HEW statement explaining provisions of H. R. 13247.
- Aug. 6, 1958 House Rules Committee reported resolution for consideration of H. R. 13247. Print of H. Res. 675 and House Report No. 2480.
- Aug. 7, 1958 House began debate.
- Aug. 8, 1958 House passed H. R. 13247 with amendments.
- Aug. 11, 1958 H. R. 13247 placed on Senate calendar. Print of bill as placed on calendar.
- Aug. 13, 1958 Senate passed H. R. 13247 with amendments.
- Aug. 18, 1958 House Rules Committee reported resolution for consideration of Senate amendments. House Rules Committee reported resolution to send H. R. 13247 to conference.
- Aug. 19, 1958 House agreed to send H. R. 13247 to conference and conferees were appointed. Senate conferees were appointed.
- Aug. 21, 1958 House received conference report. Print of House Report 2688.
- Aug. 22, 1958 Senate agreed to conference report.
- Aug. 23, 1958 House agreed to conference report.
- Sept. 2, 1958 Approved: Public Law 85-864.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 85-864

Public Law 85-864 (H. R. 13247) NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958 (approved September 2, 1958). Provides for Federal Assistance to individuals and States for the improvement of the national education system, including: loans to needy students in institutions of higher education; payments to State educational agencies for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction; awards for national defense fellowships; contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation of centers for the teaching of modern foreign languages; grants for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for education purposes; and additional aid to States for extension of vocational education to residents of areas inadequately served and to meet national defense requirements for personnel equipped to render skilled assistance in fields particularly affected by scientific and technological developments. Provides for the establishment, by the National Science Foundation, of a Science Information Service to provide for Indexing, abstracting, translating, and improving methods leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information. Provides for the establishment of a Science Information Council of 19 members, including the director of the Department of Agriculture library, to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to, the head of the Science Information Service.

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 12630

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 22, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

A BILL

To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That this Act, divided into titles and sections according
4 to the following table of contents, may be cited as the
5 “National Defense Education Act of 1958”.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 101. Findings and declaration of policy.
- Sec. 102. Federal control of education prohibited.
- Sec. 103. Definitions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

- Sec. 201. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 202. Number of scholarships.
- Sec. 203. Amount of scholarships.
- Sec. 204. Duration of scholarships.
- Sec. 205. Selection of recipients of scholarships.
- Sec. 206. Allotment of scholarships.
- Sec. 207. State scholarship commissions; State plans.
- Sec. 208. Administrative expenses of State commissions.

TITLE III—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER
EDUCATION

- Sec. 301. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 302. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 303. Payment of Federal capital contributions.
- Sec. 304. Conditions of agreements.
- Sec. 305. Terms of loans.
- Sec. 306. Distributions of assets from student loan funds.
- Sec. 307. Loans to institutions.
- Sec. 308. Administrative provisions.

TITLE IV—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS,
AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PART A—SCIENCE TEACHING EQUIPMENT

- Sec. 401. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 402. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 403. State plans.
- Sec. 404. Payments to States.

PART B—STATE CONSULTATIVE AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

- Sec. 421. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 422. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 423. State plans.
- Sec. 424. Payments to States.

TITLE V—FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

- Sec. 501. Foreign language institutes.
- Sec. 502. Foreign language centers.
- Sec. 503. Research and studies.
- Sec. 504. National Advisory Committee on Foreign Languages and Area Studies.
- Sec. 505. Appropriations authorized.

TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

- Sec. 601. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 602. Eligible programs.
- Sec. 603. Amount and conditions of payments.
- Sec. 604. National Advisory Committee on Graduate Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING, IDENTIFICATION, AND
ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

- Sec. 701. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 702. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 703. State plans.
- Sec. 704. Payments to States.

PART B—INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

- Sec. 721. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 722. Purpose.
- Sec. 723. Contract authority.
- Sec. 724. Stipends.
- Sec. 725. Payment of stipends.
- Sec. 726. Termination of stipends.

TITLE VIII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILI-
ZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA
FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

PART A—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

- Sec. 801. Appropriations authorized; functions of Commissioner.

PART B—ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NEW EDUCATIONAL MEDIA

- Sec. 821. Establishment.

TITLE IX—CONGRESSIONAL CITATION

- Sec. 901. Congressional citation for outstanding scholastic achievement.

TITLE X—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

- Sec. 1001. Statement of findings and purpose.
- Sec. 1002. Amendments to Vocational Education Act of 1946.

TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Sec. 1101. Administration.
- Sec. 1102. Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.
- Sec. 1103. Disapproval of, and failure to comply with, State plans.
- Sec. 1104. Judicial review.
- Sec. 1105. Method of payment.
- Sec. 1106. Administrative appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 1107. Acceptance of grants and bequests.
- Sec. 1108. Allotments to Territories and possessions.
- Sec. 1109. Exemption from conflict-of-interest laws of members of advisory committees.

1 TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

3 SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that
4 the security of the Nation requires the fullest development
5 of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men
6 and women. The present emergency demands that addi-
7 tional and more adequate educational opportunities be made
8 available. This requires programs that will demonstrate our
9 country's recognition of and esteem for those of our students
10 who have striven to develop their intellectual abilities to the
11 fullest extent, and will make available greater intellectual
12 opportunities that are challenging to our youth.

13 The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that
14 the States and local communities have and must retain con-
15 trol over and primary responsibility for public education.
16 The national interest requires, however, that the Federal
17 Government give assistance to education for programs which
18 are important to our defense.

19 To meet the present educational emergency requires ad-
20 ditional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore
21 the purpose of this Act to provide substantial assistance in
22 various forms to individuals, to States and their subdivi-
23 sions, and to institutions of higher education in order to in-
24 sure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to
25 meet the National defense needs of the United States.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

SEC. 102. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 103. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, except that as used in section 206 (a), 402, 422, or 702, such term does not include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or

1 other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a na-
2 tionally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if
3 not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted,
4 on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so
5 accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred
6 from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II,
7 such term includes an institution, not located in any State,
8 which the Commissioner determines to be substantially com-
9 parable to an institution which comes within the preceding
10 provisions of this subsection. For purposes of titles II
11 and III, such term includes any private business school or
12 technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses
13 (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For purposes of this sub-
14 section, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally
15 recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he
16 determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of train-
17 ing offered.

18 (c) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner
19 of Education.

20 (d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of
21 Health, Education, and Welfare.

22 (e) The term "State Commission" means a State
23 Commission on Scholarships established in any State to
24 participate in a program under title II.

25 (f) The term "State educational agency" means the

1 State board of education or other agency or officer primarily
2 responsible for the State supervision of elementary and sec-
3 ondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an
4 officer or agency designated by the governor or by State
5 law.

6 (g) The term "school-age population" means that part
7 of the population which is between the ages of five and
8 seventeen, both inclusive, and such school-age population for
9 the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner
10 on the basis of the population between such ages for the
11 most recent year for which satisfactory data are available
12 from the Department of Commerce.

13 (h) The term "resident" when used with respect to any
14 State shall have the meaning established by regulations of
15 the Commissioner and shall include a citizen of the United
16 States who is domiciled in such State but is living outside
17 of any State.

18 (i) The term "elementary school" means a public
19 school which provides elementary education, as determined
20 under State law.

21 (j) The term "secondary school" means a public school
22 which provides secondary education, as determined under
23 State law, except that it does not include any education
24 provided beyond grade 12.

25 (k) The term "local educational agency" means a

1 board of education or other legally constituted local school
 2 authority having administrative control and direction of
 3 elementary schools or secondary schools in a city, county,
 4 township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

5 (l) The term "nonprofit", as applied to a school or
 6 institution, means a school or institution owned and operated
 7 by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no
 8 part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully
 9 inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

10 (m) The term "public" as applied to any school or
 11 institution does not include a school or institution of any
 12 agency of the United States.

13 TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

14 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

15 SEC. 201. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
 16 ated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the pro-
 17 visions of this title.

18 NUMBER OF SCHOLARSHIPS

19 SEC. 202. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
 20 the Commissioner is authorized, subject to the provisions
 21 of section 206 (c), to award scholarships to twenty-five
 22 thousand persons selected by the State Commissions; and
 23 during each of the three succeeding fiscal years he is author-
 24 ized, subject to such provisions, to award scholarships to
 25 twenty-five thousand additional persons selected by the

1 State Commissions. Scholarships awarded under this title
2 shall be known as "National Defense Scholarships".

3 AMOUNT OF SCHOLARSHIPS

4 SEC. 203. Persons awarded scholarships under this title
5 shall be paid \$1,000 during each academic year of the
6 scholarship's duration, as provided in section 204. The
7 Commissioner shall arrange for the payment of such scholar-
8 ships to the recipients thereof, during the period of their
9 entitlement, in such installments and at such times as he may
10 prescribe.

11 DURATION OF SCHOLARSHIPS

12 SEC. 204. The duration of a National Defense Scholar-
13 ship awarded under this title shall be a period of time not
14 in excess of four academic years, as defined in regulations
15 of the Commissioner, or, subject to regulations of the Com-
16 missioner, such longer period as is normally required to com-
17 plete the undergraduate curriculum which the recipient is
18 pursuing; but in no event shall the duration extend beyond
19 the completion by the recipient of the work for his first
20 bachelor's degree. Notwithstanding the preceding provi-
21 sions of this section, a scholarship awarded under this title
22 shall entitle the recipient to payments only while he (1)
23 devotes essentially full time to educational work leading to
24 a bachelor's degree, during the academic year, in attendance

1 at an institution of higher education, (2) is maintaining
2 satisfactory proficiency, as determined by the State Commis-
3 sion, in the course of study which he is pursuing, and (3) is
4 not receiving expenses of tuition or other scholarship or
5 fellowship aid, or educational assistance from other Federal
6 sources (other than a monetary allowance under a reserve
7 officers' training program or money paid under other pro-
8 visions of this Act).

9 SELECTION OF RECIPIENTS OF SCHOLARSHIPS

10 SEC. 205. (a) An individual shall be eligible to compete
11 in any State for a National Defense Scholarship if he (1)
12 is a resident of the State; (2) makes application in accord-
13 ance with such rules as the State Commission for such State
14 may establish; and (3) is not, or has not been, enrolled in
15 any course of study beyond the secondary school level.

16 (b) From among those competing for National Defense
17 Scholarships for each fiscal year, each State Commission,
18 within the scholarships allotted to it under section 206,
19 shall select persons who are to be awarded such scholar-
20 ships during such year. Each State Commission shall select
21 persons to be awarded such scholarships in accordance with
22 objective tests, and other measures of aptitude and ability
23 to pursue successfully at an institution of higher education
24 a course of study leading to a bachelor's degree.

25 (c) The Commissioner shall award a National Defense

1 Scholarship to each person with respect to whom he receives
2 a certification from a State Commission that such person—

3 (1) has been selected for a National Defense Schol-
4 arship under the provisions of this section,

5 (2) has been accepted for enrollment by an insti-
6 tution of higher education, and

7 (3) (A) holds a certificate of graduation, based
8 on completion of the twelfth grade, from any high school
9 whose graduates meet the requirements established by
10 the State in which such school is located for graduation
11 from high schools accredited by such State, or (B) in
12 the case of an individual who does not hold such a cer-
13 tificate, is determined by such State Commission to have
14 attained a level of advancement generally accepted as
15 constituting the equivalent of that required for graduation
16 from such a high school.

17 ALLOTMENT OF SCHOLARSHIPS

18 SEC. 206. (a) From the National Defense Scholarships
19 which are to be awarded in any fiscal year the Commissioner
20 shall reserve such number, but not in excess of 2 per centum
21 thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in
22 section 1108. The remainder of such scholarships shall be
23 allotted among the States as follows: Each State shall be
24 allotted the number of such scholarships which bears the same
25 ratio to the total number of such scholarships being allotted

1 as its population between the ages of eighteen and twenty-
2 one, both inclusive, bears to the total population of all the
3 States between such ages, except that no partial scholarship
4 shall be allotted to any State. For the purposes of this
5 section, populations between such ages shall be determined
6 on the basis of the populations between such ages for the
7 most recent year, after 1955, for which satisfactory data are
8 available from the Department of Commerce.

9 (b) From the sums appropriated under section 201
10 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of
11 the two succeeding fiscal years, the Commisioner shall
12 allot to each State the amount he estimates will be needed
13 for continuing to make payments with respect to such year
14 to persons selected by the State Commission of such State
15 to receive payments under National Defense Scholarships
16 awarded in previous years. Sums appropriated under sec-
17 tion 201 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1962, shall
18 be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative
19 amounts needed to make such continuing payments.

20 (c) Before the beginning of each of the four fiscal years
21 during which National Defense Scholarships may be
22 awarded under this title, the Commissioner shall determine
23 the number of such scholarships which may be awarded
24 during such fiscal year, taking into consideration the amounts
25 appropriated under section 201 for that year and the amount

1 (if any) allotted to the States under the first sentence of
2 subsection (b) for continuing to make payments to persons
3 awarded such scholarships in prior years.

4 STATE SCHOLARSHIP COMMISSIONS; STATE PLANS

5 SEC. 207. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the
6 scholarship program under this title may do so by establish-
7 ing a State Commission on Scholarships, or by designating
8 an existing agency of the State to serve as the State Commis-
9 sion on Scholarships, and by submitting to the Commissioner,
10 through such commission a State plan which—

11 (1) provides for the determination of the institu-
12 tions in the State which are institutions of higher
13 education as defined in section 103 (b) ;

14 (2) provides for the determination, in accordance
15 with the provisions of section 205, of eligibility to com-
16 pete for National Defense Scholarships, for the selection,
17 in accordance with such provisions, of persons to be
18 awarded such scholarships out of the State's allotment,
19 and for certification of such persons to the Commis-
20 sioner ;

21 (3) provides for an annual review by the State
22 Commission of each outstanding scholarship to determine
23 if the recipient is maintaining satisfactory proficiency
24 in the course of study which he is pursuing ;

25 (4) provides for notifying the appropriate institu-

1 tion of higher education and the Commissioner when
2 the State Commission determines that the recipient is not
3 maintaining satisfactory proficiency in the course of study
4 which he is pursuing;

5 (5) provides that the State Commission will be the
6 sole agency for administering the plan;

7 (6) provides that the State Commission will make
8 such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and con-
9 taining such information, as may be reasonably neces-
10 sary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties
11 under this title; and

12 (7) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
13 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure
14 proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal
15 funds paid to the State under this title.

16 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
17 which complies with the conditions specified in subsection

18 (a) .

19 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF STATE COMMISSIONS

20 SEC. 208. The Commissioner shall pay to the official
21 designated in each State to receive funds for the administra-
22 tion of the State plan under this title such amounts as the
23 Commissioner determines to be necessary for the proper and
24 efficient administration of the State plan (including reim-
25 bursement to the State for expenses which the Commis-

1 sioner determines were necessary for the preparation of the
2 State plan approved under this title). The Commissioner
3 may pay under this section amounts to be used by the State
4 Commission to contract for the services of public or private
5 merit or aptitude testing organizations which are approved
6 by him.

7 TITLE III—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITU-
8 TIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

9 APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED

10 SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner
11 to stimulate and assist institutions of higher education to
12 establish funds for the making of low-interest loans to stu-
13 dents in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in such
14 institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated
15 \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
16 \$60,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years,
17 and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and
18 each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary
19 to enable students who have received a loan for any school
20 year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or complete
21 their education. Sums appropriated under this section for
22 any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agree-
23 ments between the Commissioner and institutions of higher
24 education, for payment of Federal capital contributions
25 which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall

1 be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan
2 funds.

3 ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

4 SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant
5 to section 301 for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1,
6 1962, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount
7 which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated
8 as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in
9 institutions of higher education in such State bears to the
10 total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in
11 institutions of higher education in all of the States. The
12 number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions
13 of higher education for purposes of this section shall be
14 determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year
15 for which satisfactory data are available to him.

16 (b) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any
17 fiscal year ending after June 30, 1962, shall be allotted
18 among the States as determined by the Commissioner to be
19 necessary for the purpose for which such amounts are appro-
20 priated.

21 PAYMENT OF FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

22 SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to
23 time set dates by which institutions of higher education in
24 a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions
25 from the allotment of such State. In the event the total re-

1 requested in such applications, which are made by institutions
2 with which he has agreements under this title and which
3 meet the requirements established in regulations of the Com-
4 missioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State
5 available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution
6 from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the
7 same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the
8 amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to
9 the total requested in all such applications. In the event
10 the total requested in such applications which are made by
11 institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allot-
12 ment of such State available for such purpose, the Commis-
13 sioner may reallocate the remaining amount from time to time,
14 on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other
15 States in proportion to the original allotments to such States
16 under section 302 for such year.

17 (b) In no case may the total of the Federal capital
18 contributions to any institution of higher education for any
19 fiscal year exceed \$250,000.

20 CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENTS

21 SEC. 304. (a) An agreement with any institution of
22 higher education for Federal capital contributions by the
23 Commissioner under this title shall—

1 (1) provide for establishment of a student loan
2 fund by such institution;

3 (2) provide for deposit in such fund of (A) the
4 Federal capital contributions, (B) an amount, equal
5 to 25 per centum thereof, contributed by such institu-
6 tion, (C) collections of principal and interest on student
7 loans made from such fund, and (D) other earnings
8 of the fund;

9 (3) provide that such student loan fund shall be
10 used only for loans to students in accordance with such
11 agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this
12 title, and for costs of litigation arising in connection
13 with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest
14 on such loan; and

15 (4) include such other provisions as may be neces-
16 sary to protect the financial interest of the United States
17 and promote the purposes of this title and as are agreed
18 to by the Commissioner and the institution.

19 (b) Such amounts as an institution of higher education
20 determines, in accordance with regulations of the Commis-
21 sioner, are not required currently for loans and other pay-
22 ments from a student loan fund established pursuant to this
23 title may be invested by the institution, to the extent pro-
24 vided in the agreement with the Commissioner under this
25 title—

(1) in interest-bearing securities of the United States or securities guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States; or

(2) in bonds or other obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, and public funds of the United States.

TERMS OF LOANS

SEC. 305. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year to any student made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed \$1,000, and the total for all years to any student from such funds may not exceed \$5,000.

(b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by any institution of higher education shall be made on such terms and conditions as the institution may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the institution) with a view to accomplishing the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of study and, through interest charges, prevent impairment of the capital of the student loan fund; and except that—

(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable,

1 in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good
2 standing in such course of study and has been accepted
3 for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution
4 or, in the case of a student already attending such insti-
5 tution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance
6 there either as an undergraduate or graduate student;

7 (2) preference shall be given in the granting of
8 such loans by the institution to persons who (A) have
9 received such a loan for one or more previous academic
10 years, (B) have maintained satisfactory standing at
11 such institution or another institution of higher education
12 during such previous academic years, (C) apply for
13 additional loans, and (D) are eligible for such additional
14 loans under the provisions of this title and the agree-
15 ment thereunder;

16 (3) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or
17 other written agreement which provides for repay-
18 ment of the principal amount in equal annual install-
19 ments over a ten-year period which begins one year
20 after the borrower ceases to be a full-time student at
21 the institution of higher education which made the loan
22 or at any other institution which is participating in the
23 program established under this title (or, if not par-
24 ticipating, has been approved by the Commissioner for
25 the purpose of this paragraph) : *Provided*, That such ten-

1 year period may be extended for good cause deter-
2 mined in accordance with regulations of the Commis-
3 sioner;

4 (4) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid
5 balance of the loan, at the rate of 2 per centum per
6 annum during the period prior to the first year for which
7 repayment of an installment on the principal is due
8 (such interest to be paid annually during such period)
9 and at the rate of 4 per centum per annum after such
10 period: *Provided*, That the borrower may at his option
11 repay all or any part of the loan in advance of the time
12 or times when due, and such repayment shall be made
13 without penalty and without advancing the first year for
14 which interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum, in
15 lieu of 2 per centum per annum, would otherwise be
16 payable under this title;

17 (5) no security or endorsement may be required for
18 any such loan unless the borrower is a minor and the
19 note or other evidence of obligation executed by him
20 would not, under the applicable law, create a binding
21 obligation;

22 (6) the liability to repay any such loan shall be
23 canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he be-
24 comes permanently and totally disabled as determined
25 in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

1 (7) such a loan by an institution for any year shall
2 be made in such installments as may be provided in
3 regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with
4 the institution under this title and, upon notice to the
5 Commissioner by the institution that any recipient of
6 a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any
7 or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld,
8 as may be appropriate; and

9 (8) no note or other evidence of such a loan may
10 be transferred or assigned by the institution of higher
11 education making the loan except, upon the transfer of
12 the borrower to another institution of higher education
13 participating in the program under this title (or, if not
14 participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by
15 the Commissioner for such purpose), to such institution.

16 (c) An agreement under this title for payment of Fed-
17 eral capital contributions to any institution of higher educa-
18 tion shall include provisions designed to make loans from
19 the student loan fund established pursuant to such agree-
20 ment reasonably available (to the extent of the available
21 funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such institution
22 in need thereof.

23 DISTRIBUTIONS OF ASSETS FROM STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

24 SEC. 306. (a) Not later than September 30, 1966,
25 there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the

1 student loan fund established under this title by each institu-
2 tion of higher education as follows:

3 (1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount
4 which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund
5 at the close of June 30, 1966, as the total amount of the
6 Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Com-
7 missioner under this title bears to the sum of such Fed-
8 eral capital contributions and the institution's capital con-
9 tributions to such fund.

10 (2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid
11 to the institution.

12 The balance in any loan fund shall, for purposes of the pre-
13 ceding sentence, include the fair cash value of any securities
14 or other investments or non-cash assets held by or on behalf
15 of the fund (other than accounts receivable on student
16 loans) ; and such cash values shall be determined in accord-
17 ance with procedures and criteria established by regulations
18 of the Commissioner.

19 (b) After September 30, 1966, each institution with
20 which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this
21 title shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than
22 quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received
23 by the institution after June 30, 1966, in payment of prin-
24 cipal or interest on student loans made from the student
25 loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which

1 amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of
2 litigation incurred in collection thereof and not already re-
3 imbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of
4 principal or interest) as was paid to the Commissioner under
5 subsection (a).

6 (c) Upon a finding by an institution prior to July 1,
7 1966, that the liquid assets of its student loan fund estab-
8 lished pursuant to its agreement under this title exceed the
9 amount required for loans or otherwise in the foreseeable
10 future, and upon notice by such institution to the Commis-
11 sioner, such institution may, subject to such limitations as
12 may be included in regulations of the Commissioner or in
13 such agreement, make a capital distribution from such fund.
14 Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

15 (1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount
16 which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed
17 as the Federal capital contributions by the Commis-
18 sioner to the student loan fund prior to such distribution
19 bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions
20 and the capital contributions to the fund made by the
21 institution.

22 (2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall
23 be paid to the institution.

LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS

1
2 SEC. 307. (a) Upon application by any institution of
3 higher education with which he has made an agreement
4 under this title, the Commissioner may make a loan to, or
5 purchase the obligations of, such institution for the purpose
6 of helping to finance the institution's capital contributions
7 to its student loan fund established pursuant to such agree-
8 ment. Any such loan may be made only if such institution
9 shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal
10 sources upon terms and conditions which the Commissioner
11 determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes
12 of this title. Loans made to institutions under this section
13 or obligations purchased thereunder shall bear interest at a
14 rate equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum above the rate
15 payable by the Commissioner to the Treasury for funds
16 borrowed to finance such loans and purchase such
17 obligations.

18 (b) (1) For the purpose of financing loans to institu-
19 tions under this section, the Commissioner shall issue notes,
20 debentures, or other obligations for purchase by the Secre-
21 tary of the Treasury. Obligations issued by the Commis-
22 sioner under this subsection shall be in such form and de-

1 nominations, and be subject to such terms and conditions,
2 as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval
3 of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such obligation shall bear
4 interest at a rate sufficient to cover the cost of the funds
5 to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the
6 Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields
7 of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States
8 having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans
9 made or obligations purchased by the Commissioner under
10 this section.

11 (2) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and
12 directed to purchase any obligations of the Commissioner
13 issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized
14 to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the
15 sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond
16 Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may
17 be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to in-
18 clude any purchases of the Commissioner's obligations here-
19 under. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such
20 sums as may be necessary, together with repayments made
21 by institutions hereunder, for payments on obligations issued
22 by the Commissioner under this section. Any such repay-

1 ments not required for such purpose shall be deposited in the
2 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

3 (c) Loans made and obligations purchased by the Com-
4 missioner under this section shall mature within such period
5 as may be determined by the Commissioner to be appro-
6 priate in each case, but not exceeding fifteen years.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

8 SEC. 308. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the
9 other powers conferred upon him by this title, shall have
10 power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made
11 under this title and to pay, compromise, waive, or release
12 any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however arising or
13 acquired under this title, except that nothing in this sub-
14 section shall be construed to affect the power of the Attorney
15 General in the conduct of litigation arising under this Act.

16 (b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pur-
17 suant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in con-
18 nection with such financial transactions, shall be final and
19 conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that
20 all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General
21 Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the
22 Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

1 TITLE IV—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTH-
 2 ENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MOD-
 3 ERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN
 4 PUBLIC SCHOOLS

5 PART A—SCIENCE TEACHING EQUIPMENT

6 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

7 SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
 8 priated \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
 9 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years,
 10 for making payments to State educational agencies under this
 11 part.

12 ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

13 SEC. 402. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to
 14 section 401 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve
 15 such amount, but not in excess of two per centum thereof, as
 16 he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1108.
 17 From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall
 18 allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to
 19 the amount of such remainder as the product of—

20 (1) the school-age population of the State, and

21 (2) the State's allotment ratio (as determined
 22 under subsection (b)),

23 bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the
 24 States.

25 (b) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 100

1 per centum less the product of (1) 50 per centum and (2)
2 the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of
3 school age for the State by the income per child of school
4 age for the continental United States, except that (A) the
5 allotment ratio shall in no case be less than $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum
6 or more than $66\frac{2}{3}$ per centum, and (B) the allotment ratio
7 for the District of Columbia shall be 50 per centum. The
8 allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner
9 as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and again
10 between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1960, on the
11 basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age
12 for the States and for the continental United States for the
13 three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory
14 data are available from the Department of Commerce. The
15 first such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the
16 two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and
17 ending June 30, 1960, and the second shall be conclusive
18 for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July
19 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1962.

20 (c) For the purposes of this part—

21 (1) The term “child of school age” means a mem-
22 ber of the population between the ages of five and
23 seventeen, both inclusive.

24 (2) The term “continental United States” does
25 not include Alaska or the District of Columbia.

1 (3) The term "income per child of school age"
2 for any State or for the continental United States means
3 the total personal income for the State and the conti-
4 nental United States, respectively, divided by the num-
5 ber of children of school age in such State and in the
6 continental United States, respectively.

7 (d) A State's allotment under this part shall remain
8 available for reservation of funds pursuant to section 404

9 (b) for projects in such State until the end of the fiscal year
10 following the year for which the allotment is made.

11 STATE PLANS

12 SEC. 403. (a) Any State which desires to receive pay-
13 ments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner,
14 through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

15 (1) sets forth a program under which funds paid
16 to the State under this part will be expended solely for
17 projects approved by the State educational agency for
18 (A) acquisition of laboratory and other special equip-
19 ment, including audio-visual materials and equipment
20 and printed materials (other than textbooks), suitable
21 for use in providing education in science, mathematics,
22 or modern foreign language, for use in elementary and
23 secondary schools, and (B) minor remodeling of labora-
24 tory or other space used for such materials or equipment;

(2) sets forth principles for determining the priority of projects in the State for assistance under this part and provides for undertaking such projects, insofar as financial resources available therefor and for maintenance and operation make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

(3) provides an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency to interested persons with respect to each application for the approval of a project under this part;

(4) provides for the establishment of standards on a State level for laboratory and other special equipment acquired with assistance furnished under this part;

(5) provides that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(6) provides that the State educational agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this part; and

(7) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this part.

1 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
 2 and any modification thereof which complies with the
 3 provisions of subsection (a).

4 PAYMENTS TO STATES

5 SEC. 404. From a State's allotment for a fiscal year
 6 under section 402, the Commissioner shall from time to time
 7 pay to such State an amount equal to one-half of the ex-
 8 penditures for such year under programs approved by the
 9 State educational agency under the State plan approved
 10 under section 403.

11 PART B—STATE CONSULTATIVE AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

12 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

13 SEC. 421. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
 14 priated \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
 15 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for
 16 making grants to State educational agencies under this part.

17 ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

18 SEC. 422. From the sums appropriated pursuant to sec-
 19 tion 421 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve
 20 such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as
 21 he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1108.
 22 From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall
 23 allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to
 24 the amount of such remainder as the school-age population
 25 of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations

1 of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under
 2 the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than
 3 \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total of increases
 4 thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing
 5 the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under
 6 the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be
 7 necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining
 8 States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

9 STATE PLANS

10 SEC. 423. (a) Any State which desires to accept pay-
 11 ments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner,
 12 through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

13 (1) sets forth a program under which funds paid
 14 to the State under this part will be expended by the
 15 State educational agency, or granted by it to local edu-
 16 cational agencies in the State for expenditure, to establish
 17 and maintain programs so that teachers of science,
 18 mathematics, and modern foreign languages in the sec-
 19 ondary schools of such State may be kept well informed
 20 with respect to advances of knowledge and current in-
 21 structional methods, devices, and textbooks in their teach-
 22 ings fields; such program may include (A) paying or
 23 supplementing the salaries of science, mathematics, and
 24 modern foreign language consultants employed by the
 25 State educational agency who will (i) administer such a

1 program, (ii) advise and consult with such teachers con-
2 cerning the subject matter and teaching methods in their
3 teaching fields, and (iii) advise and consult with local
4 school administrators with respect to the employment of
5 persons to supervise the teaching of science, mathe-
6 matics, and modern foreign languages at the local sec-
7 ondary school level; (B) studies and demonstrations
8 designed to modernize science, mathematics, or modern
9 foreign language curricula, instructional materials, and
10 classroom or laboratory equipment in elementary or
11 secondary schools; and (C) preservice undergraduate
12 teacher-training in science, mathematics, and modern
13 foreign languages, and training to improve the qualifica-
14 tions to teach such subjects of persons engaged, in
15 elementary or secondary schools, in teaching science,
16 mathematics, or modern foreign languages;

17 (2) sets forth the purposes for, and the conditions
18 under, which funds paid to a State under this part will
19 be granted to local educational agencies in such State;

20 (3) provides that the State educational agency will
21 be the sole agency for administering the plan;

22 (4) provides that the State educational agency will
23 make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and

1 containing such information, as may be necessary to
2 enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this
3 part; and

4 (5) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
5 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure
6 proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal
7 funds paid to the State under this part.

8 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
9 and any modification thereof which complies with the pro-
10 visions of subsection (a).

11 PAYMENTS TO STATES

12 SEC. 424. Payment under this part shall be made to
13 those State educational agencies which administer plans
14 approved under section 423 and which make application
15 therefor to the Commissioner. For the fiscal year ending
16 June 30, 1959, such payments shall equal the amount ex-
17 pended by the State in carrying out its State plan, and for
18 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the
19 two succeeding fiscal years, such payment shall equal 50
20 per centum of the amount so expended, except that no
21 State educational agency shall receive payments under this
22 part for any fiscal year in excess of that State's allotment
23 for that fiscal year as determined under section 422.

1 TITLE V—FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

2 FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

3 SEC. 501. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to
4 arrange, through grants to or contracts with institutions of
5 higher education, for the operation by them, during the
6 period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close
7 of June 30, 1962, of short-term and regular session institutes
8 for advanced training, particularly in the use of new teach-
9 ing methods and instructional materials, for individuals who
10 are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or
11 supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign
12 language in schools at the elementary or secondary level
13 or in institutions of higher education.

14 (b) A grant or contract pursuant to this section may
15 cover all or any part of the cost of the institute with respect
16 to which it is made, and may be made on such conditions
17 as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the pur-
18 poses of this section.

19 (c) The Commissioner is also authorized during the pe-
20 riod beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of
21 June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals attending any
22 institute established under this section, including allowances
23 for dependents and for travel to and from their places of
24 residence.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTERS

SEC. 502. (a) The Commissioner is authorized, through grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education, to assist such institutions, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, in the establishment and operation of centers for the teaching of any modern foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner determines (1) that individuals trained in such language are needed by the Federal Government or by business, industry, or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States. Any such grant or contract may provide for instruction not only in such modern foreign language but also in other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used, to the extent adequate instruction in such fields is not readily available, including fields such as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology. Any such grant or contract may cover not more than 50 per centum of the cost of the establishment and operation of the center with respect to which it is made, including the cost of grants to the staff for travel in the foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject matter of the field or fields in which

1 they are or will be working is concerned and the cost of
2 travel of foreign scholars to such centers to teach or assist
3 in teaching therein and the cost of their return, and shall be
4 made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds neces-
5 sary to carry out the purposes of this section.

6 (b) The Commissioner is also authorized, during the
7 period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close
8 of June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals undergoing
9 advanced training in any modern foreign language (with
10 respect to which he makes the determination under clause
11 (1) of subsection (a)), and other fields needed for a full
12 understanding of the area, region, or country in which such
13 language is commonly used, at any short-term or regular ses-
14 sion of any institution of higher education, including allow-
15 ances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of
16 residence, but only upon reasonable assurance that the re-
17 cipients of such stipends will, on completion of their training,
18 be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an
19 institution of higher education or for such other service
20 of a public nature as may be permitted in regulations of the
21 Commissioner.

22 RESEARCH AND STUDIES

23 SEC. 503. The Commissioner is authorized, directly or
24 by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the
25 need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign

1 languages and other fields needed to provide a full under-
2 standing of the areas, regions, or countries in which such
3 languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more
4 effective methods of teaching such languages and in such
5 other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in
6 such training, or in training teachers of such languages or
7 in such fields.

8 NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN LANGAUGES
9 AND AREA STUDIES

10 SEC. 504. (a) There is hereby established a National
11 Advisory Committee on Foreign Languages and Area
12 Studies, consisting of twelve members appointed, without
13 regard to the civil-service laws, by the Commissioner with
14 the approval of the Secretary. The members shall be
15 selected so as to provide a broad representation from among
16 persons who are recognized for their knowledge or interest in
17 various foreign languages and studies of foreign areas, insti-
18 tutions of higher education engaged in providing instruction
19 in such matters or training teachers therein, and the general
20 public. The Committee shall annually select one of its
21 members to serve as Chairman.

22 (b) Members of the Committee, while attending con-
23 ferences or meetings of the Committee, shall be entitled to
24 receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary,
25 but not exceeding \$50 per diem, and while away from their

1 homes or regular places of business they may be allowed
2 travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as
3 authorized by law for persons in the Government service
4 employed intermittently.

5 (c) The Committee shall advise, consult with, and make
6 recommendations to the Commissioner on matters of policy
7 and general administration under this title.

8 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

9 SEC. 505. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
10 priated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the
11 provisions of this title.

12 TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE
13 EDUCATION

14 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

15 SEC. 601. For the purpose of assisting institutions of
16 higher education to establish new or expand existing pro-
17 grams of graduate education, there are hereby authorized
18 to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
19 and each of the five succeeding fiscal years, for grants to
20 such institutions, such sums as the Congress may determine.

21 ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS

22 SEC. 602. Grants under this title may be made by the
23 Commissioner only with respect to a program of graduate
24 education (1) which is for students who have been awarded
25 a bachelor's or master's degree or a professional degree, and

1 (2) which leads to a degree of doctor of philosophy or an
2 equivalent degree.

3 AMOUNT AND CONDITIONS OF PAYMENTS

4 SEC. 603. (a) Grants under this title may be made by
5 the Commissioner on such conditions as he finds necessary
6 to carry out the purposes of this title. Any such grant to an
7 institution may not exceed (1) (A) one-half of the cost of
8 salaries of additional faculty members needed for new pro-
9 grams or the expansion of existing programs and of increases
10 in salaries of existing faculty members to reflect additional
11 duties occasioned by such new programs or the expansion of
12 existing programs, and other costs attributable to the estab-
13 lishment of new programs or the expansion of existing pro-
14 grams, including overhead costs and costs of equipment, or
15 (B) if the institution so elects with respect to a graduate
16 program, an amount equal to \$500 multiplied by the number
17 of fellowships in such program awarded pursuant to this
18 section, and (2) the cost of fellowships for graduate students
19 enrolled in a new graduate program or whose enrollment con-
20 stitutes an increase in enrollment in a graduate program.
21 Such fellowships, including allowances for dependents, shall
22 be in such amounts as may be permitted in regulations of
23 the Commissioner; shall be awarded annually by the insti-
24 tution, under criteria which are approved by the Commis-
25 sioner and provide preference for individuals who are inter-

1 ested in teaching in institutions of higher education; and shall
2 be renewable to the extent necessary to enable the recipient
3 to secure the degree awarded at the completion of the course
4 of study of the graduate program involved.

5 (b) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this
6 section (1) no fellowships may be for more than three aca-
7 demic years, (2) no fellowship may be awarded for a
8 course of study beginning after June 30, 1962, or extend-
9 ing beyond June 30, 1964, (3) the total of the payments
10 to any institution to cover the costs described in clause (1)
11 of subsection (a) for any fiscal year may not exceed
12 \$125,000, and (4) payments of the amounts referred to
13 in clause (1) of subsection (a) may not be made for any
14 period after June 30, 1962.

15 NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE
16 EDUCATION

17 SEC. 604. (a) There is hereby established a National
18 Advisory Committee on Graduate Education, consisting of
19 twelve members appointed, without regard to the civil-service
20 laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secre-
21 tary. The members shall be selected so as to provide a broad
22 representation from among various graduate fields, institu-
23 tions of higher education with programs of graduate educa-
24 tion, and the general public. The Committee shall annually
25 select one of its members to serve as Chairman.

1 (b) Members of the Committee, while attending con-
2 ferences or meetings of the Committee, shall be entitled to
3 receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary,
4 but not exceeding \$50 per diem, and while away from their
5 homes or regular places of business they may be allowed
6 travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence,
7 as authorized by law for persons in the Government service
8 employed intermittently.

9 (c) The Committee shall advise, consult with, and make
10 recommendations to the Commissioner on matters of policy
11 and general administration under this title.

12 TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING,
13 IDENTIFICATION, AND ENCOURAGEMENT
14 OF ABLE STUDENTS

15 PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

16 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

17 SEC. 701. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
18 ated \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
19 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making
20 grants to State educational agencies under this part to assist
21 them to establish and maintain programs of guidance and
22 counseling.

23 ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

24 SEC. 702. From the sums appropriated pursuant to sec-
25 tion 701 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve

1 such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum, thereof, as
2 he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1108.
3 From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall
4 allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to
5 the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of
6 such State bears to the total of school-age populations of all
7 of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the
8 preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than
9 \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total of increases
10 thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing
11 the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under
12 the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may
13 be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining
14 States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

15 STATE PLANS

16 SEC. 703. (a) Any State which desires to receive pay-
17 ments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner,
18 through its State educational agency, a State plan which—
19 (1) sets forth a program under which funds paid to
20 the State under this part will be expended by the State
21 educational agency, or granted by it to local educational
22 agencies in the State for expenditure, to establish or
23 maintain programs of guidance and counseling which
24 will operate in the secondary schools of such State and
25 be directed at (A) identifying students with outstand-

ing aptitude and ability in such schools, (B) advising students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (C) encouraging students with outstanding aptitude and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions after completion of their secondary school education; and such programs may include making surveys of elementary or secondary school programs of study as related to the higher educational systems, and may also include paying or supplementing the salaries of persons who are employed by the State educational agency to perform such guidance and counseling services;

(2) sets forth the purposes for, and the conditions under, which funds paid to a State under this part will be granted to local educational agencies in such State;

(3) provides that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(4) provides that the State educational agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this part; and

(5) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-

1 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper
2 disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid
3 to the State under this part.

4 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
5 and any modification thereof which complies with the pro-
6 visions of subsection (a).

7	PAYMENTS TO STATES
---	--------------------

8 SEC. 704. Payment under this part shall be made to
9 those State educational agencies which administer plans
10 approved under section 703 and which make application
11 therefor to the Commissioner. For the fiscal year ending
12 June 30, 1959, such payments shall equal the amount ex-
13 pended by the State in carrying out its State plan, and for
14 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the
15 two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal 50
16 per centum of the amount so expended, except that no State
17 educational agency shall receive payment under this part
18 for any fiscal year in excess of that State's allotment for
19 that fiscal year as determined under section 702. The Com-
20 missioner may pay under this section amounts to be used by
21 the State educational agency to contract for the services of
22 public or private merit or aptitude testing organizations
23 which are approved by him.

1 PART B—INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING
2 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

3 SEC. 721. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
4 priated \$6,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30,
5 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for
6 the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this part.

7 PURPOSE

8 SEC. 722. The Commissioner shall (1) contract, in
9 accordance with the provisions of this part, with institutions
10 of higher education for the purpose of establishing summer
11 and regular session institutes consisting of courses in the
12 counseling and guidance of students at the secondary school
13 level with particular emphasis upon the counseling and
14 guidance of gifted students, and (2) pay stipends under
15 the provisions of this part to eligible persons who attend
16 such institutes.

17 CONTRACT AUTHORITY

18 SEC. 723. A contract with an institution of higher edu-
19 cation under the provisions of this part shall provide for the
20 payment to such institution of the reasonable cost incurred
21 by it in providing the summer session institute contracted
22 for.

1

STIPENDS

2 SEC. 724. Any person employed in a teaching or
3 guidance and counseling capacity in a public-school system
4 who enrolls in and attends a summer or regular session insti-
5 tute contracted for under this part shall be eligible (after
6 application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75
7 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute.
8 Each such person with one or more dependents shall receive
9 an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each
10 such dependent for the period of such attendance.

11

PAYMENT OF STIPENDS

12 SEC. 725. The Commissioner shall from time to time
13 determine the amounts payable to persons under this
14 part, and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the
15 amounts so determined and the name of each person to
16 whom such amounts shall be paid. The Secretary of the
17 Treasury shall thereupon pay such person by check in
18 accordance with such certification. Such check shall be
19 transmitted through an official of the institution of higher
20 education offering the institute with respect to which such
21 payment is being made. Such official shall be selected by
22 the institution with the approval of the Commissioner. The
23 official thus selected shall transmit such check to the payee
24 only upon his determination, and certification thereof to the
25 Commissioner, that the recipient is in compliance with rules

1 and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner under this
2 part.

3 TERMINATION OF STIPENDS

4 SEC. 726. The Commissioner may terminate or suspend
5 a stipend being paid to any person under this part if such
6 person fails to comply with rules and regulations prescribed
7 by the Commissioner under this part.

8 TITLE VIII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTA-
9 TION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF
10 TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND
11 RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PUR-
12 POSES

13 PART A—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION
14 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED; FUNCTIONS OF
15 COMMISSIONER

16 SEC. 801. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
17 \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and
18 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the
19 Commissioner, directly or through grants or contracts, to—

20 (1) make studies and surveys to determine the
21 need for increased or improved utilization of television,
22 radio, motion pictures, and related media of communica-
23 tion by State or local educational agencies and institu-
24 tions of higher education in providing education;

1 (2) conduct research; demonstrations, and experi-
2 ments in the use of such media for such purposes;

(3) conduct research, demonstrations, and experiments in the development and use of new media of communication (and other audio-visual aids) for such purposes;

(4) evaluate and publish reports concerning the effectiveness of such media for such purposes; and

9 (5) prepare and publish abstracts and catalogs of
10 audio-visual materials available for such purposes to the
11 extent such abstracts or catalogs are not otherwise
12 readily available; and

13 to enable him to provide, upon request, advice, counsel, and
14 technical assistance to State or local educational agencies
15 and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize
16 such media of communication in providing education.

17 PART B—ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NEW EDUCATIONAL
18 MEDIA

19 ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 821. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on New Educational Media (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Advisory Committee"). The Advisory Committee shall consist of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, a representative of the National Science Foundation, and twelve persons appointed,

1 without regard to the civil-service laws, by the Commis-
2 sioner with the approval of the Secretary. Three of such
3 appointed members shall be individuals identified with the
4 sciences, liberal arts, or modern foreign languages in insti-
5 tutions of higher education; three shall be individuals with
6 professional status in primary or secondary education; three
7 shall be individuals of demonstrated ability in the utilization
8 or adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, and related
9 media of communication for educational purposes; and three
10 shall be individuals representative of the lay public who have
11 demonstrated an interest in the problems of communication
12 media.

13 (b) The Advisory Committee shall advise, consult with,
14 and make recommendations to the Commissioner on matters
15 relating to the utilization or adaptation of television, radio,
16 motion pictures, or related media of communication for edu-
17 cational purposes, and on matters of basic policy arising in
18 the administration of this title.

19 (c) The Commissioner may utilize the services of any
20 member or members of the Advisory Committee in connec-
21 tion with matters relating to the provisions of this title, for
22 such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may
23 determine.

24 (d) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while
25 attending conferences or meetings of the Advisory Committee

1 or while serving at the request of the Commissioner under
2 subsection (c) of this section, be entitled to receive com-
3 pensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not
4 exceeding \$50 per day, and while away from their homes
5 or regular places of business they may be allowed travel
6 expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as au-
7 thorized by law for persons in the Government service em-
8 ployed intermittently

9 TITLE IX—CONGRESSIONAL CITATION

10 CONGRESSIONAL CITATION FOR OUTSTANDING SCHOLASTIC

11 ACHIEVEMENT

12 SEC. 901. (a) Each State educational agency may
13 annually certify to the Commissioner the names of the stu-
14 dents who graduated from high schools in such State dur-
15 ing the year immediately preceding the date of such certi-
16 fication and who ranked scholastically in the highest 5 per
17 centum of their graduating class.

18 (b) The Commissioner shall present each student,
19 selected pursuant to subsection (a), with a scroll bearing the
20 inscription "Congressional Citation for Outstanding Scholas-
21 tic Achievement" and stating that such student has received
22 such scroll in recognition of his outstanding scholastic
23 achievement.

TITLE X—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
PROGRAMS

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 1001. The Congress hereby finds that the excellent programs of vocational education, which States have established and are carrying on with the assistance provided by the Federal Government under the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (the George-Barden Act), need extension to provide vocational education to residents of areas inadequately served and also to provide additional programs as may be necessary for vocational and related technical training for youths, adults, and older persons, especially for training and retraining made necessary by scientific and technological developments. It is therefore the purpose of this title to provide assistance to the States so that they may improve their vocational education programs through area vocational education programs approved by State boards of vocational education as providing needed vocational training and retraining for youths, adults, and older persons, including related instruction for apprentices.

1 AMENDMENTS TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946

2 SEC. 1002. The Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20
3 U. S. C., secs. 15i-15m, 15c-15q, 15aa-15jj) is amended
4 by adding after title II the following new title:

5 "TITLE III—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
6 PROGRAMS

7 "AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

8 "SEC. 301. There is authorized to be appropriated for
9 each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June
10 30, 1959, \$10,000,000 for area vocational education pro-
11 grams, to be apportioned for expenditure in the States as
12 provided in section 302.

13 "ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

14 "SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated for any
15 fiscal year pursuant to section 301, each State shall be en-
16 titled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio
17 to such sums as the total of the amounts apportioned under
18 title I of this Act, under the Act of March 18, 1950 (20
19 U. S. C., secs. 31-33), and under section 9 of the Act of
20 August 1, 1956 (20 U. S. C., sec. 34), to such State for
21 such year bears to the total of the amounts so apportioned
22 to all the States for such year.

23 "(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under
24 subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State certifies
25 to the Commissioner will not be required for carrying out

1 area vocational education programs (under the part of the
2 State plan meeting the requirements of section 305) shall
3 be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates
4 as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion
5 to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a)
6 for such year. Any amount so reallocated to a State shall
7 be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a).

8 "PAYMENTS TO STATES

9 "SEC. 303. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its
10 allotment under section 302 for any fiscal year shall be paid
11 on condition—

12 "(1) that there shall be spent an equal amount in
13 State or local funds, or both, for area vocational educa-
14 tion programs operated under the provisions of this title;
15 and

16 "(2) that there shall be spent in State or local
17 funds, or both, for vocational education programs oper-
18 ated under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Voca-
19 tional Education Act and titles I and II of this Act
20 not less than one-fifth of the total of such funds spent for
21 such purposes and reported to the Commissioner for the
22 five-year period beginning July 1, 1953, and ending
23 June 30, 1958.

24 "(b) The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning
25 of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him,

1 estimate the amount to be paid to each State for area voca-
2 tional education programs under this title for such period;
3 and shall pay to the State, from the allotment available
4 therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, re-
5 duced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not
6 previously adjusted under this subsection) by which he finds
7 that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for
8 any prior period for such purpose under this title was greater
9 or less than the amount which should have been paid to the
10 State for such prior period under this title for such purpose.
11 Such payments shall be made in such installments as the
12 Commissioner may determine.

13 "USE OF FUNDS

14 "SEC. 304. Funds paid to a State under this title for
15 area vocational education programs may be used, in carry-
16 ing out such programs (under the part of the State plan
17 meeting the requirements of section 305), for—

18 " (a) maintenance of adequate programs of admin-
19 istration, supervision, and teacher training;

20 " (b) salaries and necessary travel expenses of State
21 or local school personnel, including teachers, coordi-
22 nators, supervisors, vocational guidance counselors,
23 teacher-trainers, directors, administrators, and others;

24 " (c) travel expenses of members of advisory com-
25 mittees or State boards;

1 “(d) purchase, rental, or other acquisition, and
2 maintenance and repair, of instructional equipment;

3 “(e) purchase of instructional supplies and teach-
4 ing aids;

5 “(f) necessary costs of transportation of students;

6 “(g) securing necessary educational information
7 and data as a basis for the proper development of area
8 vocational education programs and programs of voca-
9 tional guidance;

10 “(h) training and work-experience training pro-
11 grams for out-of-school youths;

12 “(i) related instruction for apprentices; and

13 “(j) determining the need for, and planning and
14 developing, area vocational education programs.

15 “ADDITIONAL STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

16 “SEC. 305. (a) To be eligible to participate in this
17 title the State plan must be amended to include a new part
18 which—

19 “(1) designates the State board as the sole agency
20 for administration of such part of the plan (or for the
21 supervision of the administration thereof by local edu-
22 cational agencies) ;

23 “(2) provides minimum qualifications for teachers,
24 teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors;

1 “(3) shows the plans, policies, and methods to be
2 followed in carrying out such part of the State plan;

3 “(4) provides such accounting, budgeting, and
4 other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary
5 for the proper and efficient administration of such part
6 of the State plan; and

7 “(5) provides that the State board will make
8 such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and
9 containing such information, as are reasonably necessary
10 to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions
11 under this title.

12 “(b) The Commissioner shall approve a part of any
13 plan for purposes of this title if he finds that it fulfills the
14 conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

15 “(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable
16 notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board, finds
17 that—

18 “(1) the part of the State plan approved under sub-
19 section (b) has been so changed that it no longer com-
20 plies with any provision required by subsection (a) of
21 this section to be included in such part; or

22 “(2) in the administration of such part of the plan
23 there is a failure to comply substantially with any such
24 provision;

25 the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no fur-

1 ther payments will be made to the State from its allotments
2 under section 302 (or, in his discretion, that further pay-
3 ments will not be made to the State for projects under or
4 portions of such part of the State plan affected by such fail-
5 ure), until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such
6 failure. Until he is so satisfied the Commissioner shall make
7 no further payments to such State from its allotments under
8 section 302 (or shall limit payments to projects under or
9 portions of such part of the State plan in which there is no
10 such failure).

11 “(d) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commis-
12 sioner’s action under subsection (c) of this section, such
13 State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for
14 the circuit in which such State is located. The summons
15 and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the
16 United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify
17 and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the
18 record on which he based his action.

19 “(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless
20 substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall
21 be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may re-
22 mand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence,
23 and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified
24 findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and
25 shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the

1 further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact
2 shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary
3 to the weight of the evidence.

4 “(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the
5 action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or
6 in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to
7 review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon
8 certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United
9 States Code, section 1254.

10 “APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION

11 “SEC. 306. There are hereby authorized to be included
12 for each fiscal year in the appropriations for the Department
13 of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as are neces-
14 sary to administer the provisions of this title.

15 “DEFINITIONS

16 “SEC. 307. For purposes of this title—

17 “(a) The term ‘State’ includes Alaska, Hawaii, the
18 Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia,
19 and Guam.

20 “(b) The term ‘Commissioner’ means the Commis-
21 sioner of Education.

22 “(c) The terms ‘State plan’ and ‘State board’ shall
23 have the meaning which said terms have in the Act
24 approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114).

25 “(d) The term ‘area vocational education program’

1 means a program consisting of one or more less-than-
2 college-grade courses conducted under public supervision
3 and control and on an organized, systematic class basis,
4 which is designed to fit individuals for useful employ-
5 ment in recognized occupations, and which is made
6 available to residents, of the State or an area thereof
7 designated and approved by the State board, who either
8 have completed junior high school or, regardless of their
9 school credits, are at least sixteen years of age and
10 can reasonably be expected to profit by the instruction
11 offered.”

12 TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

13 ADMINISTRATION

14 SEC. 1101. (a) In administering this Act, the Com-
15 missioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities
16 of any agency of the Federal Government and, without
17 regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United
18 States (41 U. S. C., sec. 5), of any other public or non-
19 profit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements
20 between the Secretary and the head thereof.

21 (b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report
22 a full report of the activities under this Act, including
23 recommendations for needed revisions in its provisions.

24 (c) The Secretary shall advise and consult with the
25 heads of executive departments and independent establish-

1 ments of the Federal Government responsible for the admin-
2 istration of scholarship, fellowship, or other educational
3 programs, with a view to the full coordination of all
4 specialized scholarship, fellowship, and other educational
5 programs administered by or under all departments and
6 establishments of the Federal Government with the programs
7 established by this Act.

8 IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES OF STATE

9 EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

10 SEC. 1102. (a) For the purpose of assisting the States
11 to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of
12 educational statistics provided by State and local reports and
13 records and the methods and techniques for collecting and
14 processing educational data and disseminating information
15 about the condition and progress of education in the States,
16 there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal
17 year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding
18 fiscal years, for grants to States under this section, such sums
19 as the Congress may determine.

20 (b) Grants under this section by the Commissioner shall
21 be equal to one-half of the cost of State educational agency
22 programs to carry out the purposes of this section, including
23 (1) improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of
24 statistical data supplied by local educational units, (2) the
25 development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve

1 as guides for local educational units, (3) the conduct of con-
2 ferences and training for personnel of local educational units
3 and of periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for
4 records and reports, (4) improving methods for obtaining,
5 from other State agencies within the State, educational data
6 not collected by the State educational agency, or (5) ex-
7 pediting the processing and reporting of statistical data
8 through installation and operation of mechanical equipment.
9 The total of the payments to any State under this section
10 for any fiscal year may not exceed \$50,000.

11 (c) Payments with respect to any program of a State
12 educational agency under this section may be made (1) only
13 to the extent it is a new program or an addition to or expan-
14 sion of an existing program, and (2) only if the State plan
15 approved under subsection (d) includes such program.

16 (d) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for
17 purposes of this section if such plan—

18 (1) provides that the State educational agency shall
19 be the sole agency for carrying out programs under
20 the plan either directly or through arrangements with
21 other agencies of the State;

22 (2) sets forth the program proposed to be carried
23 out under the plan and the general policies to be followed
24 in doing so;

25 (3) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other

1 fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the
 2 proper and efficient administration of programs under
 3 the plan; and

4 (4) provides for the making of such reports to the
 5 Commissioner in such form and containing such informa-
 6 tion as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commis-
 7 sioner to perform his duties under this section.

8 DISAPPROVAL OF, AND FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH,

9 STATE PLANS

10 SEC. 1103. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally dis-
 11 approve any State plan submitted under this Act, or any
 12 modification thereof, without first affording the agency ad-
 13 ministering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a
 14 hearing.

15 (b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable
 16 notice and opportunity for hearing to the agency administer-
 17 ing a State plan approved under one of the titles of this
 18 Act, finds that—

19 (1) the State plan has been so changed that it no
 20 longer complies with the provisions of this Act govern-
 21 ing its original approval, or

22 (2) in the administration of the plan there is a
 23 failure to comply substantially with any such provision,
 24 the Commissioner shall suspend approval of the State
 25 plan, and shall notify the agency administering the plan

1 of the suspension. When approval of a State plan has been
2 suspended by the Commissioner such approval shall remain
3 suspended until he is satisfied that there is no longer any
4 such failure to comply.

5 (c) (1) While approval of a State plan submitted
6 under title II is suspended by the Commissioner he shall
7 not award new scholarships to individuals certified to him
8 by the State Commission (or the Commissioner, in his dis-
9 cretion, may provide that the State Commission will not be
10 eligible to participate in the part of a program under the
11 title, or in the part of the State plan, which is affected by
12 the failure to comply).

13 (2) While approval of a State plan submitted under
14 part A or B of title IV or part A of title VII is suspended by
15 the Commissioner he shall make no further payments under
16 that part for programs in the State.

17 JUDICIAL REVIEW

18 SEC. 1104. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the
19 Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of
20 a State plan submitted under a title of this Act, or with
21 respect to his final action under section 1103 (b), such
22 State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file
23 in the United States district court for the district in which
24 the capital of the State is located, a petition to review such
25 action. The petition for review shall (1) contain a concise

1 statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based and
2 (2) designate that part of the Commissioner's decision
3 sought to be reviewed.

4 (b) Notification of the filing of the petition for review
5 shall be given by the clerk of the court by mailing a copy of
6 the petition to the Commissioner.

7 (c) No costs or docket fees shall be charged or imposed
8 with respect to any judicial review proceedings, or appeal
9 therefrom, taken under this Act.

10 (d) Upon receipt of the petition for review the Commis-
11 sioner shall, within twenty days thereafter, certify and file
12 in the court the record on review, consisting of the complete
13 transcript of the proceedings before the Commissioner. No
14 party to such review shall be required, by rule of court or
15 otherwise, to print the contents of such record filed in the
16 court.

17 (e) All appeals from orders of the Commissioner shall
18 be heard anew in the district court on the record filed, unless
19 the court, for good cause shown, and on such terms as may
20 be just, orders that other evidence be received.

21 (f) The court after review may dismiss the petition or
22 deny the relief prayed for, or may suspend, modify, or set
23 aside, in whole or in part, the action of the Commissioner,
24 or may compel action unlawfully withheld. The judgment

1 of the court shall be subject to review as provided in section
2 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

3 METHOD OF PAYMENT

4 SEC. 1105. Payments under this Act to any individual
5 or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher
6 education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant
7 or contract, may be made in installments, and in
8 advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of
9 grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpay-
10 ments or underpayments.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

12 SEC. 1106. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
13 priated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for
14 each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary
15 for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

16 ACCEPTANCE OF GRANTS AND BEQUESTS

17 SEC. 1107. The Commissioner is authorized to accept
18 gifts, grants, bequests, or devises for carrying out the pro-
19 visions of this Act.

20 ALLOTMENTS TO TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

21 SEC. 1108. The National Defense Scholarships reserved
22 by the Commissioner under section 206, and the amounts
23 reserved by the Commissioner under sections 402, 422, and
24 702 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among Alaska,

1 Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Vir-
2 gin Islands, according to their respective needs for the type
3 of assistance furnished under the part or title in which the
4 section appears.

5 EXEMPTION FROM CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST LAWS OF MEM-
6 BERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

7 SEC. 1109. (a) Any member of an advisory committee
8 appointed under this Act is hereby exempted, with respect
9 to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283,
10 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and
11 section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States
12 (5 U. S. C., sec. 99), except as otherwise specified in sub-
13 section (b) of this section.

14 (b) The exemption granted by subsection (a) shall not
15 extend—

16 (1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connec-
17 tion with the appointee's Government service from any
18 source other than the private employer of the appointee
19 at the time of his appointment, or

20 (2) during the period of such appointment, and
21 the further period of two years after the termination
22 thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prose-

1 cution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against
2 the Government involving any matter concerning which
3 the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his
4 appointment during the period of such appointment.

A BILL

To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

By Mr. ELLIOTT

MAY 22, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 1, 1915

1. To amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An Act to
2. amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An Act to

A BILL

3. To amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An Act to
4. amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An Act to
5. amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An Act to

6. To amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An Act to
7. amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An Act to
8. amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An Act to
9. amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An Act to
10. amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An Act to
11. amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An Act to
12. amend the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled 'An Act to

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13247

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 1, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the
committee on Education and Labor

A BILL

To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist
in the expansion and improvement of educational programs
to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That this Act, divided into titles and sections according
4 to the following table of contents, may be cited as the
5 "National Defense Education Act of 1958".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 101. Findings and declaration of policy.
Sec. 102. Federal control of education prohibited.
Sec. 103. Definitions.

I—O

J. 20001—1

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

- Sec. 201. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 202. Amount of scholarships.
- Sec. 203. Duration of scholarships.
- Sec. 204. Selection of recipients of scholarships.
- Sec. 205. Allotment of appropriations for scholarships.
- Sec. 206. State scholarship commissions; State plans.
- Sec. 207. Administrative expenses of State commissions.

TITLE III—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

- Sec. 301. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 302. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 303. Payment of Federal capital contributions.
- Sec. 304. Conditions of agreements.
- Sec. 305. Terms of loans.
- Sec. 306. Distributions of assets from student loan funds.
- Sec. 307. Loans to institutions.
- Sec. 308. Administrative provisions.

TITLE IV—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

- Sec. 401. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 402. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 403. State plans.
- Sec. 404. Payments to States.

TITLE V—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

- Sec. 501. Language institutes.
- Sec. 502. Language and area centers.
- Sec. 503. Research and studies.
- Sec. 504. Appropriations authorized.

TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

- Sec. 601. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 602. Number of fellowships.
- Sec. 603. Award of fellowships and approval of institutions.
- Sec. 604. Fellowship stipends.
- Sec. 605. Fellowship conditions.

TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

- Sec. 701. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 702. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 703. State plans.
- Sec. 704. Payments to States.

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS—Continued

PART B—INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

Sec. 721. Appropriations authorized.

Sec. 722. Purpose.

Sec. 723. Contract authority.

Sec. 724. Stipends.

TITLE VIII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Sec. 801. Appropriations authorized; functions of Commissioner.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 901. Administration.

Sec. 902. Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

Sec. 903. Disapproval of, and failure to comply with, State plans.

Sec. 904. Judicial review.

Sec. 905. Method of payment.

Sec. 906. Administrative appropriations authorized.

Sec. 907. Acceptance of gifts and bequests.

Sec. 908. Allotments to Territories and possessions.

Sec. 909. Advisory committees.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. This requires programs that will demonstrate our country's recognition of and esteem for those of our students who have striven to develop their intellectual abilities to the fullest

1 extent, and will make available greater intellectual oppor-
2 tunities that are challenging to our youth.

3 The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that
4 the States and local communities have and must retain con-
5 trol over and primary responsibility for public education.
6 The national interest requires, however, that the Federal
7 Government give assistance to education for programs which
8 are important to our defense.

9 To meet the present educational emergency requires ad-
10 ditional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore
11 the purpose of this Act to provide substantial assistance in
12 various forms to individuals for study at institutions of higher
13 education, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to
14 insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity
15 to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

16 **FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED**

17 **SEC. 102.** Nothing contained in this Act shall be con-
18 strued to authorize any department, agency, officer, or em-
19 ployee of the United States to exercise any direction, super-
20 vision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction,
21 administration, or personnel of any educational institution
22 or school system.

23 **DEFINITIONS**

24 **SEC. 103.** As used in this Act—

25 (a) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii,

1 Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone,
2 Guam, or the Virgin Islands, except that as used in section
3 205 (a), 402, or 702, such term does not include Alaska,
4 Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin
5 Islands.

6 (b) The term "institution of higher education" means
7 an educational institution in any State which (1) admits
8 as regular students only persons having a certificate of grad-
9 uation from a school providing secondary education, or the
10 recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally
11 authorized within such State to provide a program of educa-
12 tion beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educa-
13 tional program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or
14 provides not less than a two-year program which is accept-
15 able for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or
16 other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a na-
17 tionally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if
18 not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted,
19 on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so
20 accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred
21 from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II,
22 such term includes an institution, not located in any State,
23 which the Commissioner determines to be substantially com-
24 parable to an institution which comes within the preceding
25 provisions of this subsection. For purposes of titles II

1 and III, such term includes any private business school or
2 technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses
3 (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For purposes of this sub-
4 section, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally
5 recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he
6 determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of train-
7 ing offered.

8 (c) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner
9 of Education.

10 (d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of
11 Health, Education, and Welfare.

12 (e) The term "State Commission" means a State
13 Commission on Scholarships established or designated in any
14 State to participate in a program under title II.

15 (f) The term "State educational agency" means the
16 State board of education or other agency or officer primarily
17 responsible for the State supervision of elementary and sec-
18 ondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an
19 officer or agency designated by the governor or by State
20 law.

21 (g) The term "school-age population" means that part
22 of the population which is between the ages of five and
23 seventeen, both inclusive, and such school-age population for
24 the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner
25 on the basis of the population between such ages for the

1 most recent year for which satisfactory data are available
2 from the Department of Commerce.

3 (h) The term "resident" when used with respect to any
4 State shall have the meaning established by regulations of
5 the Commissioner and shall include a citizen of the United
6 States who is domiciled in such State but is living outside
7 of any State.

8 (i) The term "elementary school" means a public
9 school which provides elementary education as determined
10 under State law.

11 (j) The term "secondary school" means a public school
12 which provides secondary education, as determined under
13 State law, except that it does not include any education
14 provided beyond grade 12.

15 (k) The term "local educational agency" means a
16 board of education or other legally constituted local school
17 authority having administrative control and direction of
18 elementary schools or secondary schools in a city, county,
19 township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

20 (l) The term "nonprofit", as applied to a school or
21 institution, means a school or institution owned and operated
22 by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no
23 part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully
24 inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

25 (m) The term "public" as applied to any school or

1 institution does not include a school or institution of any
2 agency of the United States.

3 TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

4 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

5 SEC. 201. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
6 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the
7 three succeeding fiscal years the sum of \$17,500,000 for
8 scholarships to persons who have not previously been
9 awarded scholarships under this title and who are selected
10 for award of such scholarships by the State Commissions.
11 In addition there are authorized to be appropriated for the
12 fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the six
13 succeeding fiscal years such sums as are estimated to be nec-
14 essary for making payments to individuals who have pre-
15 viously been awarded scholarships under this title. Scholar-
16 ships awarded under this title shall be known as "National
17 Defense Scholarships".

18 AMOUNT OF SCHOLARSHIPS

19 SEC. 202. Persons awarded scholarships under this
20 title shall be paid \$500 during each academic year of the
21 scholarships' duration as provided in section 203. Any
22 such person who is determined by the State Commission,
23 in accordance with the provisions of the State plan referred
24 to in section 206 (a) (3), to need additional financial
25 assistance to continue his education at an institution of

1 higher education, shall be paid an additional amount, not
2 to exceed \$500, during each such year based on his financial
3 need, such amount to be determined in accordance with
4 such provisions.

5 DURATION OF SCHOLARSHIPS

6 SEC. 203. The duration of a National Defense Scholar-
7 ship awarded under this title shall be a period of time not
8 in excess of four academic years, as defined in regulations
9 of the Commissioner, or, subject to regulations of the Com-
10 missioner, such longer period as is normally required to com-
11 plete the undergraduate curriculum which the recipient is
12 pursuing; but in no event shall the duration extend beyond
13 the completion by the recipient of the work for his first
14 bachelor's degree. Notwithstanding the preceding provi-
15 sions of this section, a scholarship awarded under this title
16 shall entitle the recipient to payments for such period only
17 if the Commissioner finds that he (1) devotes essentially
18 full time to educational work leading to a bachelor's degree,
19 during the academic year, in attendance at an institution of
20 higher education, (2) is maintaining satisfactory proficiency
21 in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the
22 regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution
23 which he is attending, and (3) is not receiving expenses
24 of tuition or other scholarship or fellowship aid or educational

1 assistance from other Federal sources (other than a monetary
2 allowance under a reserve officers' training program or
3 money paid under other provisions of this Act).

4 SELECTION OF RECIPIENTS OF SCHOLARSHIPS

5 SEC. 204. (a) An individual shall be eligible to compete
6 in any State for a National Defense Scholarship if he (1)
7 is a resident of the State; (2) makes application in accord-
8 ance with such rules as the State Commission for such State
9 may establish; and (3) is not, or has not been, enrolled in
10 any course of study beyond the secondary school level.

11 (b) From among those competing for National Defense
12 Scholarships for each fiscal year, each State Commission,
13 within the amount allotted to it for scholarships under sec-
14 tion 205 (a), shall select persons who are to be awarded
15 such scholarships during such year. Each State Commission
16 shall select persons to be awarded such scholarships in ac-
17 cordance with objective tests and other measures of apti-
18 tude and ability to pursue successfully at an institution of
19 higher education a course of study leading to a bachelor's
20 degree, giving special consideration to those with superior
21 capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern
22 foreign language.

23 (c) The Commissioner shall award a National Defense
24 Scholarship to each person with respect to whom he receives
25 a certification from a State Commission that such person—

(1) has been selected for a National Defense Scholarship under the provisions of this section,

(2) has been accepted for enrollment by an institution of higher education, and

(3) (A) holds a certificate of graduation, based on completion of the twelfth grade, from any high school whose graduates meet the requirements established by the State in which such school is located for graduation from high schools accredited by such State, or (B) in the case of an individual who does not hold such a certificate, is determined by such State Commission to have attained a level of advancement generally accepted as constituting the equivalent of that required for graduation from such a high school.

ALLOTMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SCHOLARSHIPS

SEC. 205. (a) From the sum appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to the first sentence of section 201 the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum of such sum, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 908. The remainder of such sum shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States as follows: Each State shall be allotted an amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate sum being allotted as its population between ages of 18 and 21, both inclusive, bears to the total population of all the States between such

1 ages. For the purposes of this section, populations between
2 such ages shall be determined on the basis of the popula-
3 tions between such ages for the most recent year, after
4 1955, for which satisfactory data are available from the
5 Department of Commerce.

6 (b) Sums appropriated under the second sentence of
7 section 201 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1959,
8 shall be allotted by the Commissioners among the States on
9 the basis of the relative amounts estimated to be needed to
10 make continuing payments for each such year to persons
11 selected by the State Commissions to be awarded National
12 Defense Scholarships in previous years.

13 **STATE SCHOLARSHIP COMMISSIONS; STATE PLANS**

14 **SEC. 206.** (a) Any State desiring to participate in the
15 scholarship program under this title may do so by establish-
16 ing a State Commission on Scholarships, or by designating
17 an existing agency of the State to serve as the State Commis-
18 sion on Scholarships, and by submitting to the Commissioner,
19 through such commission a State plan which—

20 (1) provides for the determination of the institu-
21 tions in the State which are institutions of higher
22 education as defined in section 103 (b) ;

23 (2) provides for the determination, in accordance
24 with the provisions of section 204, of eligibility to com-

1 pete for National Defense Scholarships, for the selection,
2 in accordance with such provisions, of persons to be
3 awarded such scholarships out of the State's allotment,
4 and for certification of such persons to the Commis-
5 sioner;

6 (3) provides (A) for the annual determination of
7 the additional amounts to be awarded persons in need
8 thereof under section 202 in accordance with standards,
9 procedures, and criteria established by the State Com-
10 mission, which the Commissioner finds provide reason-
11 able assurance (i) that the additional amount will be
12 based on the individual's need for financial assistance to
13 continue his education at an institution of higher educa-
14 tion, such need to be determined without regard to tui-
15 tion, fees, and other expenses of attendance at the institu-
16 tion of higher education chosen by the individual, and
17 (ii) that the maximum additional amount allowable
18 under the plan shall be \$500, and (B) for the annual
19 certification, of each such additional amount and the
20 person to whom it is to be paid, to the Commissioner;

21 (4) provides that the State Commission will be the
22 sole agency for administering the plan;

23 (5) provides that the State Commission will make
24 such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and con-

1 taining such information, as may be reasonably neces-
2 sary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties
3 under this title; and

4 (6) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
5 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure
6 proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal
7 funds paid to the State under this title.

8 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
9 which complies with the conditions specified in subsection
10 (a).

11 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF STATE COMMISSIONS

12 SEC. 207. The Commissioner shall pay to each State
13 such amounts as the Commissioner determines to be neces-
14 sary for the proper and efficient administration of the State
15 plan (including reimbursement to the State for expenses
16 which the Commissioner determines were necessary for the
17 preparation of the State plan approved under this title).

18 TITLE III—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITU- 19 TIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

20 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

21 SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner
22 to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of
23 higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans
24 to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in

1 such institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropri-
2 ated \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
3 \$60,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years,
4 and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and
5 each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary
6 to enable students who have received a loan for any school
7 year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or complete
8 their education. Sums appropriated under this section for
9 any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agree-
10 ments between the Commissioner and institutions of higher
11 education, for payment of Federal capital contributions
12 which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall
13 be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan
14 funds.

15 ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

16 SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant
17 to section 301 for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1,
18 1962, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount
19 which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated
20 as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in
21 institutions of higher education in such State bears to the
22 total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in
23 institutions of higher education in all of the States. The
24 number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions

1 of higher education for purposes of this section shall be
2 determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year
3 for which satisfactory data are available to him.

4 (b) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any
5 fiscal year ending after June 30, 1962, shall be allotted
6 among the States in such manner as the Commissioner deter-
7 mines to be necessary to carry out the purpose for which
8 such amounts are appropriated,

9 PAYMENT OF FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

10 SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to
11 time set dates by which institutions of higher education in
12 a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions
13 from the allotment of such State. In the event the total re-
14 quested in such applications, which are made by institutions
15 with which he has agreements under this title and which
16 meet the requirements established in regulations of the Com-
17 missioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State
18 available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution
19 from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the
20 same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the
21 amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to
22 the total requested in all such applications. In the event
23 the total requested in such applications which are made by
24 institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allot-
25 ment of such State available for such purpose, the Commis-

1 sioner may reallocate the remaining amount from time to time,
2 on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other
3 States in proportion to the original allotments to such States
4 under section 302 for such year. The Federal capital con-
5 tribution to an institution shall be paid to it from time to
6 time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will
7 not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan
8 fund.

9 (b) In no case may the total of such Federal capital
10 contributions to any institution of higher education for any
11 fiscal year exceed \$250,000.

12 CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENTS

13 SEC. 304. An agreement with any institution of higher
14 education for Federal capital contributions by the Commis-
15 sioner under this title shall—

16 (1) provide for establishment of a student loan
17 fund by such institution;

18 (2) provide for deposit in such fund of (A) the
19 Federal capital contributions, (B) an amount, not less
20 than 25 per centum thereof, contributed by such institu-
21 tion, (C) collections of principal and interest on student
22 loans made from such fund, and (D) any other earnings
23 of the fund;

24 (3) provide that such student loan fund shall be

1 used only for loans to students in accordance with such
2 agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this
3 title, and for costs of litigation arising in connection
4 with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest
5 on such loan; and

6 (4) include such other provisions as may be neces-
7 sary to protect the financial interest of the United States
8 and promote the purposes of this title and as are agreed
9 to by the Commissioner and the institution.

10 TERMS OF LOANS

11 SEC. 305. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year
12 to any student made by institutions of higher education from
13 loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this
14 title may not exceed \$1,000, and the total for all years to
15 any student from such funds may not exceed \$5,000.

16 (b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by
17 any institution of higher education shall be made on such
18 terms and conditions as the institution may determine; sub-
19 ject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and require-
20 ments as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation
21 or in the agreement with the institution) with a view to
22 preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund
23 to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the
24 objective of enabling the student to complete his course of
25 study; and except that—

1 (1) such a loan shall be made only to a student
2 who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue
3 a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable,
4 in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good
5 standing in such course of study and has been accepted
6 for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution
7 or, in the case of a student already attending such insti-
8 tution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance
9 there either as an undergraduate or graduate student;

10 (2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or
11 other written agreement which provides for repay-
12 ment of the principal amount in equal annual install-
13 ments over a ten-year period which begins one year
14 after the borrower ceases to be a full-time student at
15 the institution of higher education which made the loan
16 or at any other institution which is participating in the
17 program established under this title (or, if not par-
18 ticipating, has been approved by the Commissioner for
19 the purpose of this paragraph) : *Provided*, That such ten-
20 year period may be extended for good cause deter-
21 mined in accordance with regulations of the Commis-
22 sioner;

23 (3) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid
24 balance of the loan, at the rate of 2 per centum per
25 annum during the period prior to the first year for which

1 repayment of an installment on the principal is due
2 (such interest to be paid annually during such period)
3 and at the rate of 4 per centum per annum after such
4 period: *Provided*, That the borrower may at his option
5 repay all or any part of the loan in advance of the time
6 or times when due, and such repayment shall be made
7 without penalty and without advancing the first year for
8 which interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum, in
9 lieu of 2 per centum per annum, would otherwise be
10 payable under this title;

11 (4) no security or endorsement may be required for
12 any such loan unless the borrower is a minor and the
13 note or other evidence of obligation executed by him
14 would not, under the applicable law, create a binding
15 obligation;

16 (5) the liability to repay any such loan shall be
17 canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he be-
18 comes permanently and totally disabled as determined
19 in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

20 (6) such a loan by an institution for any year shall
21 be made in such installments as may be provided in
22 regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with
23 the institution under this title and, upon notice to the
24 Commissioner by the institution that any recipient of
25 a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any

1 or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld,
2 as may be appropriate; and

3 (7) no note or other evidence of such a loan may
4 be transferred or assigned by the institution of higher
5 education making the loan except, upon the transfer of
6 the borrower to another institution of higher education
7 participating in the program under this title (or, if not
8 participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by
9 the Commissioner for such purpose), to such institution.

10 (c) An agreement under this title for payment of Fed-
11 eral capital contributions to any institution of higher educa-
12 tion shall include provisions designed to make loans from
13 the student loan fund established pursuant to such agree-
14 ment reasonably available (to the extent of the available
15 funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such institution
16 in need thereof.

17 DISTRIBUTIONS OF ASSETS FROM STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

18 SEC. 306. (a) After June 30, 1966, and not later than
19 September 30, 1966, there shall be a capital distribution of
20 the balance of the student loan fund established under this
21 title by each institution of higher education as follows:

22 (1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount
23 which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund
24 at the close of June 30, 1966, as the total amount of the
25 Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Com-

1 missioner under this title bears to the sum of such Fed-
2 eral capital contributions and the institution's capital con-
3 tributions to such fund.

4 (2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid
5 to the institution.

6 (b) After September 30, 1966, each institution with
7 which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this
8 title shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than
9 quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received
10 by the institution after June 30, 1966, in payment of prin-
11 cipal or interest on student loans made from the student
12 loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which
13 amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of
14 litigation incurred in collection thereof and not already re-
15 imbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of
16 principal or interest) as was paid to the Commissioner under
17 subsection (a).

18 (c) Upon a finding by the institution or the Commis-
19 sioner prior to July 1, 1966, that the liquid assets of a student
20 loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this
21 title exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the
22 foreseeable future, and upon notice to such institution and
23 to the Commissioner, there shall be, subject to such limita-
24 tions as may be included in regulations of the Commissioner

1 or in such agreement, a capital distribution from such fund.

2 Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

3 (1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount
4 which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed
5 as the Federal capital contributions by the Commis-
6 sioner to the student loan fund prior to such distribution
7 bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions
8 and the capital contributions to the fund made by the
9 institution.

10 (2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall
11 be paid to the institution.

12 LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS

13 SEC. 307. (a) Upon application by any institution of
14 higher education with which he has made an agreement
15 under this title, the Commissioner may make a loan to such
16 institution for the purpose of helping to finance the institu-
17 tion's capital contributions to a student loan fund established
18 pursuant to such agreement. Any such loan may be made
19 only if such institution shows it is unable to secure such funds
20 from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which
21 the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent
22 with the purposes of this title. Loans made to institutions
23 under this section shall bear interest at a rate equal to one-
24 fourth of 1 per centum above the rate payable by the Com-

1 missioner to the Treasury for funds borrowed to finance such
2 loans.

3 (b) (1) For the purpose of financing loans to institu-
4 tions under this section, the Commissioner shall issue notes,
5 debentures, or other obligations for purchase by the Secre-
6 tary of the Treasury. Obligations issued by the Commis-
7 sioner under this subsection shall be in such form and de-
8 nominations, and be subject to such terms and conditions,
9 as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval
10 of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such obligations shall bear
11 interest at a rate sufficient to cover the cost of the funds
12 to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the
13 Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields
14 of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States
15 having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans
16 made by the Commissioner under this section.

17 (2) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and
18 directed to purchase any obligations of the Commissioner
19 issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized
20 to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the
21 sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond
22 Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may
23 be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to in-

1 clude any purchases of the Commissioner's obligations here-
2 under. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such
3 sums as may be necessary, together with repayments made
4 by institutions hereunder, for payments on obligations issued
5 by the Commissioner under this section. Any such repay-
6 ments not required for such purpose shall be deposited in the
7 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

8 (c) Loans made by the Commissioner under this section
9 shall mature within such period as may be determined by
10 the Commissioner to be appropriate in each case, but not
11 exceeding fifteen years.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

13 SEC. 308. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the
14 other powers conferred upon him by this title, shall have
15 power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made
16 under this title and to compromise, waive, or release
17 any right, title, claim, or demand, however arising or
18 acquired under this title, except that nothing in this sub-
19 section shall be construed to affect the power of the Attorney
20 General in the conduct of litigation arising under this Act.

21 (b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pur-
22 suant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in con-

1 nection with such financial transactions, shall be final and
2 conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that
3 all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General
4 Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the
5 Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

6 TITLE IV—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTH-
7 ENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MOD-
8 ERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN
9 PUBLIC SCHOOLS

10 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

11 SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
12 ated \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
13 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making
14 payments to State educational agencies under this title for
15 the acquisition of equipment (suitable for use in provid-
16 ing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign
17 language) and for minor remodeling which are referred to
18 in paragraph (1) of section 403 (a). There are hereby
19 authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year
20 ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding
21 fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agen-
22 cies under this title to carry out the programs referred to in
23 paragraph (5) of section 403 (a).

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 402. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 401 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 908. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

(A) the school-age population of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)),

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(2) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the continental United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum or more than $66\frac{2}{3}$ per centum. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and

1 August 31 of the year 1959, on the basis of the average
2 of the incomes per child of school age for the States and
3 for the continental United States for the three most recent
4 consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available
5 from the Department of Commerce. The first such promul-
6 gation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in
7 the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30,
8 1960, and the second shall be conclusive for each of the two
9 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending
10 June 30, 1962.

11 (3) For the purposes of this title—

12 (A) The term “child of school age” means a mem-
13 ber of the population between the ages of five and
14 seventeen, both inclusive.

15 (B) The term “continental United States” does not
16 include Alaska.

17 (C) The term “income per child of school age” for
18 any State or for the continental United States means the
19 total personal income for the State and the continental
20 United States, respectively, divided by the number of
21 children of school age in such State and in the conti-
22 nental United States, respectively.

23 (4) A State's allotment under this subsection shall re-
24 main available for payment pursuant to section 404 (a) for

1 projects in such State until the end of the fiscal year following
2 the year for which the allotment is made.

3 (b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the sec-
4 ond sentence of section 401 for any fiscal year the Com-
5 missioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2
6 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as
7 provided in section 908. From the remainder of such sums
8 the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which
9 bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the
10 school-age population of such State bears to the total of the
11 school-age populations of all of the States. The amount
12 allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any
13 fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to
14 \$20,000, the total thereby required being derived by propor-
15 tionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remain-
16 ing States under the preceding sentence, but with such ad-
17 justments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of
18 any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced
19 to less than \$20,000.

20 STATE PLANS

21 SEC. 403. (a) Any State which desires to receive pay-
22 ments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner,
23 through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

1 (1) sets forth a program under which funds paid
2 to the State from its allotment under section 402 (a)
3 will be expended solely for projects approved by the
4 State educational agency for (A) acquisition of labora-
5 tory and other special equipment, including audio-visual
6 materials and equipment and printed materials (other
7 than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education
8 in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language,
9 for use in elementary or secondary schools, or both, and
10 (B) minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used
11 for such materials or equipment;

12 (2) sets forth principles for determining the prior-
13 ity of such projects in the State for assistance under
14 this title and provides for undertaking such projects,
15 insofar as financial resources available therefor make
16 possible, in the order determined by the application of
17 such principles;

18 (3) provides an opportunity for a hearing before the
19 State educational agency to interested persons with
20 respect to each application for the approval of such a
21 project under this title;

22 (4) provides for the establishment of standards on
23 a State level for laboratory and other special equipment
24 acquired with assistance furnished under this title;

25 (5) sets forth a program under which funds paid to

1 the State from its allotment under section 402 (b) will
2 be expended solely for (A) expansion or improvement
3 of supervisory or related services in the fields of
4 science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and
5 (B) administration of the State plan;

6 (6) provides that the State educational agency will
7 be the sole agency for administering the plan;

8 (7) provides that the State educational agency will
9 make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and
10 containing such information, as may be reasonably nec-
11 essary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties
12 under this title; and

13 (8) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
14 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure prop-
15 er disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid
16 to the State under this title.

17 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
18 and any modification thereof which complies with the pro-
19 visions of subsection (a).

20 PAYMENTS TO STATES

21 SEC. 404. (a) From a State's allotment for a fiscal year
22 under section 402 (a), the Commissioner shall, from time to
23 time during the period such allotment is available for pay-
24 ment as provided in paragraph (4) of section 402 (a), pay
25 to such State an amount equal to one-half of the expendi-

1 tures for projects for acquisition of equipment and minor re-
 2 modeling referred to in paragraph (1) of section 403 (a)
 3 which are carried out under its State plan approved under
 4 section 403 (b) ; except that no State shall receive payments
 5 under this subsection for any period in excess of its allotments
 6 for such period under section 402 (a) .

7 (b) From a State's allotment under section 402 (b) for
 8 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner shall
 9 from time to time pay to such State an amount equal to the
 10 amount expended by such State for such year to carry out
 11 the program referred to in paragraph (5) of section 403 (a)
 12 under its State plan approved under section 403 (b) . From
 13 a State's allotment under section 402 (b) for the fiscal year
 14 ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding
 15 fiscal years, such payment shall equal 50 per centum of the
 16 amount so expended under its State plan approved under
 17 section 403 (b) ; except that no State shall receive payments
 18 under this subsection for any fiscal year in excess of its allot-
 19 ment under section 402 (b) for that fiscal year.

20 TITLE V—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

21 LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

22 SEC. 501. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to
 23 arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher edu-
 24 cation, for the operation by them, during the period begin-
 25 ning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30,

1 1962, of short-term regular session institutes for advanced
2 training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods
3 and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged
4 in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising
5 or training teachers of any modern foreign language in
6 schools at the elementary or secondary level or in institu-
7 tions of higher education.

8 (b) A contract pursuant to this section may cover
9 all or any part of the cost of the institute with respect
10 to which it is made, and may be made on such conditions
11 as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the pur-
12 poses of this section.

13 (c) The Commissioner is also authorized during the pe-
14 riod beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of
15 June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals attending any
16 institute established under this section, including allowances
17 for dependents and for travel to and from their places of
18 residence.

19 LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS

20 SEC. 502. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to ar-
21 range through contracts with institutions of higher education
22 for the establishment and operation by them, during the
23 period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of
24 June 30, 1962, of centers for the teaching of any modern
25 foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner

1 determines (1) that individuals trained in such language are
2 needed by the Federal Government or by business, industry,
3 or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate
4 instruction in such language is not readily available in the
5 United States. Any such contract may provide for instruc-
6 tion not only in such modern foreign language but also in
7 other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the
8 areas, regions, or countries in which such language is com-
9 monly used, to the extent adequate instruction in such fields
10 is not readily available, including fields such as history, po-
11 litical science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography,
12 and anthropology. Any such contract may cover not more
13 than 50 per centum of the cost of the establishment and
14 operation of the center with respect to which it is made,
15 including the cost of grants to the staff for travel in the for-
16 eign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject mat-
17 ter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working
18 is concerned and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to such
19 centers to teach or assist in teaching therein and the cost of
20 their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the
21 Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of
22 this section.

23 (b) The Commissioner is also authorized, during the

1 period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close
2 of June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals undergoing
3 advanced training in any modern foreign language (with
4 respect to which he makes the determination under clause
5 (1) of subsection (a)), and other fields needed for a full
6 understanding of the area, region, or country in which such
7 language is commonly used, at any short-term or regular ses-
8 sion of any institution of higher education, including allow-
9 ances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of
10 residence, but only upon reasonable assurance that the re-
11 cipients of such stipends will, on completion of their training,
12 be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an
13 institution of higher education or for such other service
14 of a public nature as may be permitted in regulations of the
15 Commissioner.

16 RESEARCH AND STUDIES

17 SEC. 503. The Commissioner is authorized, directly or
18 by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the
19 need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign
20 languages and other fields needed to provide a full under-
21 standing of the areas, regions, or countries in which such
22 languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more
23 effective methods of teaching such languages and in such

1 other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in
 2 such training, or in training teachers of such languages or
 3 in such fields.

4 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

5 SEC. 504. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
 6 priated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the
 7 provisions of this title, not to exceed \$4,500,000 in any one
 8 fiscal year.

9 TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE 10 EDUCATION

11 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

12 SEC. 601. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
 13 ated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the pro-
 14 visions of this title.

15 NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS

16 SEC. 602. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
 17 the Commissioner is authorized to award one thousand fel-
 18 lowships under the provisions of this title, and during each
 19 of the three succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award
 20 one thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellow-
 21 ships shall be for periods of study not in excess of three aca-
 22 demic years.

23 AWARD OF FELLOWSHIPS AND APPROVAL OF INSTITUTIONS

24 SEC. 603. (a) The Commissioner shall award fellow-
 25 ships under this title to individuals accepted for study in

1 graduate programs approved by him under this section. The
2 Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an insti-
3 tution of higher education only upon application by the insti-
4 tution and only upon his finding that:

5 (1) such program is a new program or an existing
6 program which has been expanded,

7 (2) such new program or expansion of an existing
8 program will substantially further the objective of in-
9 creasing the facilities available in the Nation for the
10 graduate training of college or university level teachers
11 and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of
12 such facilities throughout the Nation, and

13 (3) in the acceptance of persons for study in such
14 programs preference will be given to persons interested
15 in teaching in institutions of higher education.

16 (b) The total of the fellowships awarded under this
17 title for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program
18 at any institution of higher education may not exceed
19 a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the
20 objective referred to in subsection (a) (2).

21 **FELLOWSHIP STIPENDS**

22 **SEC. 604.** (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under
23 the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of \$2,000
24 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate
25 degree, \$2,200 for the second such year, and \$2,400 for

1 the third such year, plus an additional amount of \$400 for
2 each such year on account of each of his dependents.

3 (b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant
4 to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of
5 higher education at which each such person is pursuing
6 his course of study such amount, not less than \$500 or more
7 than \$2,500 per academic year, as is determined by the
8 Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the
9 new graduate program or of the expansion in an existing
10 graduate program which he is pursuing, which is reasonably
11 attributable to such person.

12 FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

13 SEC. 605. A person awarded a fellowship under the
14 provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments
15 provided in section 604 (a) only during such periods as
16 the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory
17 proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study
18 or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded,
19 in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in
20 gainful employment other than part-time employment by
21 such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities
22 approved by the Commissioner.

1 TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING;
2 IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT
3 OF ABLE STUDENTS

4 PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

5 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

6 SEC. 701. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
7 ated \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
8 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making
9 grants to State educational agencies under this part to assist
10 them to establish and maintain programs of testing and
11 guidance and counseling.

12 ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

13 SEC. 702. From the sums appropriated pursuant to sec-
14 tion 701 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve
15 such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as
16 he may determine for allotment as provided in section 908.
17 From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall
18 allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to
19 the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of
20 such State bears to the total of school-age populations of all
21 of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the
22 preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than

1 \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total of increases
2 thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing
3 the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under
4 the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may
5 be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining
6 States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

7 **STATE PLANS**

8 SEC. 703. (a) Any State which desires to receive pay-
9 ments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner,
10 through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

11 (1) sets forth (A) a program under which funds
12 paid to the State under this part will be expended by
13 the State educational agency, or granted by it to local
14 educational agencies in the State for expenditure, to
15 establish or maintain programs of testing and guidance
16 and counseling which will operate in the secondary
17 schools of such State and be directed at (i) identifying
18 students with outstanding aptitude and ability in such
19 schools, (ii) advising students of courses of study best
20 suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (iii)
21 encouraging students with outstanding aptitude and
22 ability to complete their secondary school education,
23 take the necessary courses for admission to institutions
24 of higher education, and enter such institutions after

1 completion of their secondary school education; and

2 (B) the means of testing which will be utilized in carry-
3 ing out such programs;

4 (2) sets forth the purposes for, and the conditions
5 under, which funds paid to a State under this part will
6 be granted to local educational agencies in such State;

7 (3) provides that the State educational agency
8 will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

9 (4) provides that the State educational agency
10 will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such
11 form and containing such information as may be reason-
12 ably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform
13 his duties under this part; and

14 (5) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
15 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper
16 disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid
17 to the State under this part.

18 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
19 and any modification thereof which complies with the pro-
20 visions of subsection (a).

21 PAYMENTS TO STATES

22 SEC. 704. Payment under this part shall be made to
23 those State educational agencies which administer plans
24 approved under section 703. For the fiscal year ending

1 therefor to the Commissioner. For the fiscal year ending
2 June 30, 1959, such payments shall equal the amount ex-
3 pended by the State in carrying out its State plan, and for
4 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the
5 two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal 50
6 per centum of the amount so expended; except that no State
7 educational agency shall receive payment under this part
8 for any fiscal year in excess of that State's allotment for
9 that fiscal year as determined under section 702.

10 PART B—INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING
11 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

12 SEC. 721. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
13 priated \$6,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30,
14 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for
15 the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this part.

16 PURPOSE

17 SEC. 722. The Commissioner shall (1) arrange through
18 contracts with institutions of higher education for the estab-
19 lishment and operation by them of summer or regular session
20 institutes consisting of courses in the counseling and guidance
21 of students at the secondary school level with emphasis upon
22 the counseling and guidance of gifted students, and (2) pay
23 stipends under the provisions of this part to eligible persons
24 who attend such institutes.

CONTRACT AUTHORITY

SEC. 723. A contract with an institution of higher education under the provisions of this part shall provide for the payment to such institution of the reasonable cost incurred by it in providing the summer or regular session institute contracted for.

STIPENDS

SEC. 724. Any person employed in a public-school system who is employed or is to be employed in a guidance and counseling capacity on a full- or part-time basis and who enrolls in and attends a summer or regular session institute contracted for under this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute. Each such person with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance. However, no person shall receive a stipend under this title at a rate in excess of his last rate of salary for the immediately preceding academic year. Stipends under this section shall be paid only for periods during which the recipient is in attendance in good standing at the institute as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with its regularly prescribed standards and practices.

1 TITLE VIII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTA-
2 TION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF
3 TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND
4 RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PUR-
5 POSES

6 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED; FUNCTIONS OF
7 COMMISSIONER

8 SEC. 801. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
9 \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and
10 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the
11 Commissioner, through grants or contracts, to—

12 (1) make studies and surveys to determine the
13 need for increased or improved utilization of television,
14 radio, motion pictures, and related media of communica-
15 tion by State or local educational agencies and institu-
16 tions of higher education in providing education;

17 (2) conduct research, demonstrations, and experi-
18 ments in the use of such media for such purposes;

19 (3) conduct research, demonstrations, and experi-
20 ments in the development and use of new media of
21 communication (and other audio-visual aids) for such
22 purposes;

23 (4) evaluate and publish reports concerning the
24 effectiveness of such media for such purposes; and

25 (5) prepare and publish abstracts and catalogs of

1 audio-visual materials available for such purposes to the
2 extent such abstracts or catalogs are not otherwise
3 readily available; and

4 to enable him to provide, upon request, advice, counsel, and
5 technical assistance to State or local educational agencies
6 and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize
7 such media of communication in providing education.

8 TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

9 ADMINISTRATION

10 SEC. 901. (a) In administering this Act, the Com-
11 missioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities
12 of any agency of the Federal Government and, without
13 regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United
14 States (41 U. S. C., sec. 5), of any other public or non-
15 profit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements
16 between the Secretary and the head thereof.

17 (b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report
18 a full report of the activities under this Act, including
19 recommendations for needed revisions in its provisions.

20 (c) The Secretary shall advise and consult with the
21 heads of executive departments and independent establish-
22 ments of the Federal Government responsible for the admin-
23 istration of scholarship, fellowship, or other educational
24 programs, with a view to the full coordination of all
25 specialized scholarship, fellowship, and other educational

1 programs administered by or under all departments and
2 establishments of the Federal Government with the programs
3 established by this Act.

4 IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES OF STATE
5 EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

6 SEC. 902. (a) For the purpose of assisting the States
7 to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of
8 educational statistics provided by State and local reports and
9 records and the methods and techniques for collecting and
10 processing educational data and disseminating information
11 about the condition and progress of education in the States,
12 there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal
13 year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding
14 fiscal years, for grants to States under this section, such sums
15 as the Congress may determine.

16 (b) Grants under this section by the Commissioner shall
17 be equal to one-half of the cost of State educational agency
18 programs to carry out the purposes of this section, including
19 (1) improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of
20 statistical data supplied by local educational units, (2) the
21 development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve
22 as guides for local educational units, (3) the conduct of con-
23 ferences and training for personnel of local educational units
24 and of periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for
25 records and reports, (4) improving methods for obtaining,

1 from other State agencies within the State, educational data
2 not collected by the State educational agency, or (5) ex-
3 pediting the processing and reporting of statistical data
4 through installation and operation of mechanical equipment.
5 The total of the payments to any State under this section
6 for any fiscal year may not exceed \$50,000.

7 (c) Payments with respect to any program of a State
8 educational agency under this section may be made (1) only
9 to the extent it is a new program or an addition to or expan-
10 sion of an existing program, and (2) only if the State plan
11 approved under subsection (d) includes such program.

12 (d) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for
13 purposes of this section if such plan—

14 (1) provides that the State educational agency shall
15 be the sole agency for carrying out programs under
16 the plan either directly or through arrangements with
17 other agencies of the State;

18 (2) sets forth the program proposed to be carried
19 out under the plan and the general policies to be followed
20 in doing so;

21 (3) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
22 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure
23 proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds
24 paid to the State under this section; and

25 (4) provides for the making of such reports to the

1 Commissioner in such form and containing such informa-
2 tion as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commis-
3 sioner to perform his duties under this section.

4 DISAPPROVAL OF, AND FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH,
5 STATE PLANS

6 SEC. 903. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally dis-
7 approve any State plan submitted under this Act, or any
8 modification thereof, without first affording the agency ad-
9 ministering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a
10 hearing.

11 (b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable
12 notice and opportunity for hearing to the agency administer-
13 ing a State plan approved under one of the titles of this
14 Act, finds that—

15 (1) the State plan has been so changed that it no
16 longer complies with the provisions of this Act govern-
17 ing its original approval, or

18 (2) in the administration of the plan there is a
19 failure to comply substantially with any such provision,
20 the Commissioner shall suspend approval of the State
21 plan, and shall notify the agency administering the plan
22 of the suspension. When approval of a State plan has been
23 suspended by the Commissioner such approval shall remain
24 suspended until he is satisfied that there is no longer any
25 such failure to comply.

1 (c) (1) While approval of a State plan submitted
2 under title II is suspended by the Commissioner he shall
3 not award new scholarships to individuals certified to him
4 by the State Commission (or the Commissioner, in his dis-
5 cretion, may provide that the State Commission will not be
6 eligible to participate in the part of a program under the
7 title, or in the part of the State plan, which is affected by
8 the failure to comply).

9 (2) While approval of a State plan submitted under
10 title IV, part A of title VII, or section 902 is suspended by
11 the Commissioner he shall make no further payments under
12 that title, part, or section (as the case may be) for programs
13 in the State.

14 JUDICIAL REVIEW

15 SEC. 904. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the
16 Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval
17 of a State plan submitted under this Act, or with re-
18 spect to his final action under section 903 (b), such State
19 may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file in
20 the United States district court for the district in which
21 the capital of the State is located, a petition to review such
22 action. The petition for review shall (1) contain a concise
23 statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based and
24 (2) designate that part of the Commissioner's decision
25 sought to be reviewed.

1 (b) Notification of the filing of the petition for review
2 shall be given by the clerk of the court by mailing a copy of
3 the petition to the Commissioner.

4 (c) No costs or docket fees shall be charged or imposed
5 with respect to any judicial review proceedings, or appeal
6 therefrom, taken under this Act.

7 (d) Upon receipt of the petition for review the Commis-
8 sioner shall, within twenty days thereafter, certify and file
9 in the court the record on review, consisting of the complete
10 transcript of the proceedings before the Commissioner. No
11 party to such review shall be required, by rule of court or
12 otherwise, to print the contents of such record filed in the
13 court.

14 (e) The court after review may dismiss the petition or
15 deny the relief prayed for, or may suspend, modify, or set
16 aside, in whole or in part, the action of the Commissioner,
17 or may compel action unlawfully withheld. The judgment
18 of the court shall be subject to review as provided in section
19 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

20 **METHOD OF PAYMENT**

21 SEC. 905. Payments under this Act to any individual
22 or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher
23 education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant
24 or contract, may be made in installments, and in
25 advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of

1 grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpay-
2 ments or underpayments.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

4 SEC. 906. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
5 priated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for
6 each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary
7 for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

8 ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS AND BEQUESTS

9 SEC. 907. The Commissioner is authorized to accept
10 gifts, grants, bequests, or devises for carrying out the pro-
11 visions of this Act.

12 ALLOTMENTS TO TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

13 SEC. 908. The National Defense Scholarships reserved
14 by the Commissioner under section 205 (a), and the amounts
15 reserved by the Commissioner under sections 402 and
16 702 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among Alaska,
17 Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Vir-
18 gin Islands, according to their respective needs for the type
19 of assistance furnished under the part or title in which the
20 section appears.

21 ADVISORY COMMITTEES

22 SEC. 909. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval
23 of the Secretary, may appoint an advisory committee, or
24 advisory committees, to advise and consult with him with
25 respect to the administration of titles V, VI, and VIII

1 of this Act. Members of an advisory committee ap-
2 pointed under this section, while attending conferences or
3 meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive com-
4 pensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not
5 exceeding \$50 per diem, and while away from their homes
6 or regular places of business they may be allowed travel
7 expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as au-
8 thorized by law for persons in the Government service
9 employed intermittently.

10 (b) Any member of an advisory committee appointed
11 under this section is hereby exempted, with respect to such
12 appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284,
13 and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section
14 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U. S. C.,
15 sec. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (c)
16 of this section.

17 (c) The exemption granted by subsection (b) shall not
18 extend—

19 (1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connec-
20 tion with the appointee's Government service from any
21 source other than the private employer of the appointee
22 at the time of his appointment, or

1 (2) during the period of such appointment, and
2 the further period of two years after the termination
3 thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prose-
4 cution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against
5 the Government involving any matter concerning which
6 the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his
7 appointment during the period of such appointment.

A BILL

To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

By Mr. ELLIOTT

JULY 1, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 3, 1958
For actions of July 2, 1958
85th-2d, No. 110

CONTENTS

Accounting.....	29	Grasshoppers.....	7	Small business.....	3,18
Appropriations.....	1,11	Hog-cholera.....	2	Statehood.....	17,20
Area redevelopment.....	8	Legislative program.....	8	Surplus commodities.....	6
Budget.....	29	Marketing facilities.....	8	Surplus property.....	21
Buildings.....	25	Military construction.....	8	Textiles.....	1
CCC.....	26	Minerals.....	13,27	Transportation.....	12
Crop insurance.....	24	Personnel ethics.....	16	Weather.....	19
Education.....	5	Public Law 480.....	6,8	Wheat.....	7
Electrification.....	23	Research.....	2,10,19	Wildlife.....	28
Farm program.....	2,9				
Flood control.....	4				
Foot-and-mouth disease.....	2				
Foreign aid.....	1,6,22				
Foreign trade.....	15				
Forestry.....	2,14				
Grain.....	26				

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed mutual security appropriation bill. Senate committee reported bill for research on increased industrial uses of farm products. Sen. Proxmire criticized administration farm policies.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 253 to 126, without amendment H. R. 13192, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1959. (pp. 11746-81) Rejected, 66 to 133, an amendment by Rep. Canfield which would have provided that none of the funds shall be used to establish textile processing plants in any foreign country. (pp. 11772-78)
2. FARM PROGRAM. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported the following bills:
(p. D629)
 - S. 3076, to authorize the transportation in the U. S. of live foot-and-mouth disease virus for research purposes.
 - S. 3478, to insure the maintenance of an adequate supply of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus.
 - H. R. 12704, to authorize the use of receipts from the National Forests for general local government purposes as well as for public schools and public roads.
 - H. R. 6542, to authorize the conveyance of certain forest lands to the town of Dayton, Wyo.

3. SMALL BUSINESS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 7963, to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency and increase the SBA loan authority. Senate conferees were appointed July 1. p. 11781

The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 3651, to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small business concerns. p. 11795

4. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed without amendment S. 2964, to grant the consent of Congress to a compact between Mass. and Conn. relating to flood control. A similar bill, H. R. 9924, which had been reported earlier by the Public Works Committee (H. Rept. 2105) was tabled. S. 2964 will now be sent to the President. pp. 11784-86, 11796

5. EDUCATION. The Education and Labor Committee ordered reported H. R. 13247, a clean bill in lieu of H. R. 12630, to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of education programs to meet critical national needs. p. D630

A subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee ordered reported H. R. 13241, to provide assistance to the States for area vocational education programs. p. D630

6. FOREIGN AID; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Rep. Hill urged early enactment of legislation for the extension of Public Law 480, and inserted a release of this Department announcing agreements with various countries for the disposal of surplus commodities. p. 11792

7. WHEAT; INSECTS. Rep. Hill cited the serious situation caused by the grasshopper infestation in the Great Plains area, and inserted a release by this Department on efforts by the Department and local governments to control the infestation. pp. 11792-93

8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that S. 3420, to extend Public Law 480, will be considered under suspension of the rules Mon., July 7, and that the Consent Calendar will be called. He announced that the following bill will be considered later in the week: S. 3683, the area redevelopment bill; H. R. 4504, marketing facilities for perishable commodities; S. 3651, equity capital and long term credit for small businesses; and H. R. 13015, the military construction authorization bill. p. 11779

SENATE

9. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Proxmire criticized the administration's farm policies and urged support for a program of production limitations to grow only what can be sold at a fair price. He inserted an article, "United States Expects Peak In Farm Subsidies--Cost of Program Now Put at 6 Billion, Up 1.4 Billion From Budget Figures." pp. 11695-4

Sen. Sparkman inserted an article on the reduced cotton production and its effect on the South. pp. 11695-6

10. RESEARCH. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported an original bill, S. 4100, to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes (S. Rept. 1795). p. 11682

11. APPROPRIATION. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 12858, the civil functions appropriation bill for the Army, certain agencies of the Interior Department, and the TVA for 1959 (S. Rept. 1796). p. 11682

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued July 16, 1958

For actions of July 15, 1958

85th-2d, No. 118

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments....	48,49	Legislative program....	28	Research.....	17,37,46
Appropriations.....	9,26,32	Marketing facilities....	34	School lunch.....	44
Area redevelopment.....	12	Meatpackers.....	2	Seeds.....	1
Atomic energy.....	50	Milk.....	51	Small business.....	11
Brucellosis.....	41	Monopolies.....	18,51	Subsidies.....	39
Civil defense.....	21,33,47	Nominations.....	23,50	Surplus commodities....	30
Dairy cooperatives.....	19	Peanuts.....	49	Taxation.....	11
Economic situation.....	24	Personnel.....	8,27,38	Trade agreements.....	14,28
Education.....	4	Poultry.....	36	TVA.....	23
Electrification.....	25	Price supports.....	48,49	Water, pollution.....	7,31
Farm income.....	43	Public Law 480.....	30	resources.....	20,42
Farm program.....	15,48	Public works.....	10	Weather.....	46
Federal-State relations..	3	Reclamation.....	40	Wheat.....	48
Food.....	40				
Foreign aid.....	22,32				
Foreign currencies.....	29				
Foreign trade.....	29				
Forestry.....	13,16,35				
Fruits and vegetables...	34				
Industrial uses.....	17				
Information.....	52				
Labor standards.....	45				
Lands.....	5,6				

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported trade agreements extension bill. Sen. Johnson announced delay in debate on farm bill. House committee reported bill to amend Federal Seed Act. Both Houses received President's message for study of Fed.-pay systems. House subcommittee tentatively agreed to amendments to Packers-Stockyards bill.

HOUSE

1. SEED MARKETING. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 1939, to make various amendments to the Federal Seed Act regarding labeling requirements (H. Rept. 2160). p. 12649
2. MEATPACKERS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee "met in executive session and tentatively agreed on certain amendments to H. R. 9020, the packers and stockyards bill." p. D681
3. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. Began debate on H. R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. pp. 12607-627
4. EDUCATION. The Education and Labor Committee reported without amendment H. R. 13247, to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical needs (H. Rept. 2157). p. 12649

5. DESERT-LAND ENTRIES. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 359, to permit desert-land entries on disconnected tracts of lands which, in the case of any 1 entryman, form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres. p. D682
6. PUBLIC LANDS. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported S. 3569, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange Federal lands for certain lands owned by Utah. p. D682
7. WATER POLLUTION. A subcommittee of the Public Works Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 11714, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Act so as to increase the limitation on certain grants for construction from \$250,000 to \$500,000. p. D682
8. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported H. R. 1168, to clarify the application of Sec. 507 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to the preservation of the rates of basic compensation of certain employees in cases involving downgrading actions p. D682
Both Houses received from the President a message recommending establishment of a Joint Commission on the Civilian Employee Compensation Policy of the Federal Government to study all compensation systems in the three branches of the Federal Government and to report thereon before Jan. 1, 1960. pp. 12562, 12600-01
9. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 12858, the public works appropriations bill for 1959. Senate conferees have not yet been appointed. pp. 12601-02
10. PUBLIC WORKS. The Judiciary Committee tabled H. R. 9374, to require bonds for certain public works construction contracts. p. D682
11. SMALL BUSINESS. The Ways and Means Committee ordered reported H. R. 13382, the proposed Small Business Tax Revision Act of 1959. p. D683
12. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Van Zandt urged that a rule be requested and granted immediately on S. 3683, the area redevelopment bill, so that the legislation may be considered during this session of Congress. p. 12702
13. FORESTRY. Received from the Comptroller General a report on the review of activities of region 6 of the Forest Service. p. 12649

SENATE

14. TRADE AGREEMENTS. The Finance Committee reported with amendments H. R. 12591, to amend and extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (S. Rept. 1838). pp. 12533-5

Sen. Douglas read a list of the 48 industries which have applied for escape clause investigation in the last 10 years, concluded that "the list indicates that the reciprocal-trade program has not done much damage to American industry," and inserted a statement by the American Ass'n of Hardwood Plywood Users. pp. 12538-9

On July 10, Sen. Kennedy submitted (for himself and Sens. Humphrey, Douglas, Javits, and Neuberger) an amendment to H. R. 12591, to extend the Trade Agreements Act. The amendment would add a Title II, to establish a Trade Adjustment Board which would aid communities, industries, enterprises and individuals in

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

JULY 15, 1958.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. BARDEN, from the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 13247]

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of this bill, H. R. 13247, is to assist in the improvement and strengthening of our educational system at all levels and to encourage able students to continue their education beyond high school. It is designed to accomplish these objectives by (1) establishing a limited program of Federal scholarships, (2) establishing loan programs for students at institutions of higher education, (3) providing grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools, (4) establishing language institutes and area centers to expand and improve the teaching of languages, (5) assisting in the expansion of graduate education, (6) assisting in the improvement of guidance, counseling, and testing programs, (7) providing for research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes, and (8) improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

The bill contains all of the corresponding proposals recommended in 1958 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, plus two others, the loan program and the provision for research and experimen-

tation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes.

America is confronted with a serious and continuing challenge in many fields. The challenge—in science, industry, government, military strength, international relations—stems from the forces of totalitarianism. This challenge, as well as our own goal of enlargement of life for each individual, requires the fullest possible development of the talents of our young people. American education, therefore, bears a grave responsibility in our times.

It is no exaggeration to say that America's progress in many fields of endeavor in the years ahead—in fact, the very survival of our free country—may depend in large part upon the education we provide for our young people now.

The primary responsibility for education, in the future as in the past, should remain with the States and local communities and higher educational institutions. The Nation looks primarily to citizens and parents acting in their own communities, to school boards and city councils and State legislatures, to teachers and school administrators, and to the trustees and faculties of our colleges and universities to develop the support and the educational effectiveness needed to bring our educational system more abreast of today's needs.

In an effort which is so critical to the national interest and to national security, however, the Federal Government can and should play a constructive role. This role should be one of encouragement and assistance to the States and communities and higher educational institutions as they strive to meet certain critical national needs.

There is ample precedent for such action. For example, as early as 1862, the Federal Government acted to meet a national need in education by providing aid to land-grant colleges. During World War I, Congress recognized a great national need for more agricultural and mechanical training by enacting the vocational education program. With Federal support and encouragement, the States and communities greatly strengthened their own educational activities in these fields. This program over the years has contributed greatly to individual opportunity and to national strength.

In much the same way, H. R. 13247 is designed to help our educational system meet the grave challenge of our time. Although the bill embraces a variety of approaches, its central purpose is to encourage improvement in the quality of education particularly with respect to those aspects which are most important now to national defense.

One of the greatest needs in American education today is a new esteem for scholarship, a new respect for the crucial importance of education. These intangible objectives cannot be assured, of course, by any governmental decree or action—they result only from a sense of values developed within the people. The committee believes, however, that the proposed legislation, through which the Federal Government would give recognition and support to basic scholastic achievement, would help develop in this country new incentives and encouragement, and new prestige, for academic accomplishment. The committee believes the enactment of this legislation will help to develop a better atmosphere for emphasis on good academic education.

A number of provisions in the bill are aimed specifically at reducing the waste of needed talent which results when students with great

potential ability drop out of school or college too soon. Several other provisions are designed to encourage an improvement and expansion in the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Another provision recognizes the need for more college teachers to prepare future scientists, teachers, and leaders in many fields.

Although our national security is handicapped by shortages of highly trained persons in all fields of endeavor, many thousands of young people with high ability drop out of high school before graduation or fail to attend college subsequent to graduation. This is a loss not only to these young people, but to the Nation as a whole. The bill provides grants to support improved State and local programs of counseling, guidance, and testing to help identify able students and encourage them to remain in school and achieve their optimum of performance based on their intelligence and aptitude. The bill also provides a limited scholarship program as a major incentive to able students, and to help assure that those identified as having great ability will not be denied educational advancement because of lack of funds. Further, a program of loans to college and university students is provided to help students who need financial assistance to continue and complete their education.

It is exceedingly important to maintain a balanced program of instruction in all fields. The committee does not desire that one field of training be developed at the expense of another. It is evident, however, that many of our elementary and secondary schools today are not providing instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages of sufficient quality or quantity to meet today's increasing needs in these fields. Serious shortages of equipment in all three fields exist. H. R. 13247 provides financial assistance to States for use by local school systems in improving equipment and materials in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, both in quality and in quantity. Grants also are provided to assist State departments of education in expanding their professional services to local schools in these subjects. In addition to grants to the States, the legislation authorizes the establishment of institutes for teachers to improve the quality of instruction of modern foreign languages in the elementary schools, the secondary schools, and the colleges and universities. Language institutes and area study centers would also be established to provide training in the so-called "rare" languages, many of which are not now taught in the United States, but which are spoken by many millions of people and are essential to the conduct of our economic, cultural, and political relations with other peoples. Grants for basic research in improved instruction and newer methods and materials in the teaching of modern foreign languages are also provided.

Serious shortages of faculty members already exist in colleges and universities; yet, enrollments are expected to double by 1970. H. R. 13247 proposes to assist in resolving this problem by awarding fellowships to students who intend to complete advanced graduate education and enter college teaching as a profession. In order to encourage the expansion of facilities to train these additional graduate students the bill authorizes cost-of-education payments to institutions of higher education on behalf of students attending graduate schools on fellowships financed under title VI of this bill.

The progress of education depends in no small measure upon accurate information concerning the development of our educational system. Nationwide data on our schools is reported to the Office of Education by State educational agencies. These agencies frequently find it difficult, if not impossible, to provide nationally needed statistical information on a current basis. This legislation provides direct assistance to State departments of education to enable them to meet more fully and quickly the requirements which are placed upon them for furnishing adequate educational statistics.

The members of the committee believe that the bill offers an effective approach to those critical areas of shortage and neglect which now carry highest priority in the national interest—in the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. The committee believes, too, that the related sequence of programs in testing, counseling, scholarships, loans, and fellowships—to identify, encourage, and assist the ablest students who need help—will be of great value in the continuing effort to conserve and develop the critically needed human resources of our country.

In the development of this legislation, the committee members have sought to preserve the fundamental principle that education in our country is a State and local responsibility. States and institutions of higher education retain basic responsibility for planning and administering the programs authorized in the bill.

ESTIMATED COST OF THE PROGRAM

The estimated cost of the bill is approximately \$840 million for the basic 4-year period, and an additional \$230 million during the next 3 years as the program is phased out on an annually reduced level. The following table indicates the estimated cost for each title for each fiscal year:

Estimated cost, H. R. 13247

	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966
Title II—National Defense Scholarships— State administration and testing—	\$17,500,000	\$35,000,000	\$52,500,000	\$70,000,000	\$52,500,000	\$35,000,000	\$17,500,000	(1)
Title III—Loans to Students in Institutions of Higher Education—	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	-----
Title IV—Grants to States for Strengthening Science, Mathematics, and Modern Foreign Language Instruction in Public Schools—	40,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	45,000,000	30,000,000	15,000,000	\$5,000,000
Title V—Language Development—	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-----
Title VI—Expansion of Graduate Education—	2,159,000	3,209,700	4,415,700	3,899,900	-----	-----	-----	-----
Title VII—Guidance, Counseling, Testing; Identification and Encouragement of Able Students—	4,800,000	12,200,000	19,900,000	22,500,000	15,300,000	7,800,000	-----	-----
Title VIII—Research and Experimentation on More Effective Utilization of Television, Radio, Motion Pictures, and Related Mediums for Educational Purposes—	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-----
Title IX—Improvement of Statistical Services of State Educational Agencies—	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-----
	1,000,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total—	156,959,000	203,409,700	230,315,700	249,899,900	115,550,000	75,550,000	35,250,000	5,000,000

¹ Students in 5-year baccalaureate programs who are awarded fellowships in fiscal year 1962 will be entitled to occupy these fellowships in 1966. No estimate can be provided at this time.

NOTE.—Federal administrative costs will approximate \$3,100,000 in fiscal year 1959 and \$3,600,000 in fiscal year 1960.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

This title contains a statement of findings and declaration of policy, a section prohibiting Federal control of education, and definitions of terms used throughout the bill.

TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

Description of the program

This title authorizes the appropriation of \$17.5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of 3 succeeding fiscal years, to provide new scholarships to qualified high school graduates who have been selected by State scholarship commissions. There is also authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years, such sums as would be necessary for making payments to individuals previously awarded national defense scholarships. Scholarship recipients will be paid at least \$500 during each academic year, but not to exceed 4 academic years or, subject to regulations of the Commissioner, such longer periods as are normally required to complete the undergraduate curriculum pursued. A scholarship recipient who is determined by the State commission to need additional financial assistance could be paid an additional amount as determined by the State commission, but not to exceed an additional \$500 for each academic year.

Based upon an estimated average scholarship stipend of \$750, approximately 23,000 scholarships will be awarded in each of the first 4 years. The approximate number of students attending colleges or universities under this scholarship program for each year will be as follows: 1958-59, 23,000; 1959-60, 46,000; 1960-61, 69,000; 1961-62, 92,000; 1962-63, 69,000; 1963-64, 46,000; 1964-65, 23,000.

National defense scholarship recipients will be selected by the State commissions on the basis of objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability to pursue a course of higher education, with special consideration given to applicants with "superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics or a modern foreign language." Students will be completely free to select their own course of study and to choose their own college or university.

The appropriations will be allotted among the States on the basis of relative college-age population (18-21 inclusive) as determined by the most recent estimate from the Department of Commerce. Each year the Commissioner will also allot to each State the amount needed for continuing to make payments for scholarships awarded in previous years and for new scholarships to be awarded during that year. In each fiscal year, the Commissioner of Education shall reserve a sum not to exceed 2 percent of the authorized appropriation for the allotment of scholarships to the Territories and possessions of the United States according to their respective needs.

A State desiring to participate in the program must establish a State commission on scholarships or designate an existing State agency to serve as the commission. The scholarship commission is required to submit to the Commissioner a State plan for the administration of the scholarship program. The Commissioner shall approve this plan if it complies with requirements specified in the act. The adminis-

trative expenses of the State commissions, including the cost of the preparation of the State plan, will be paid by the Commissioner.

The basic objective of this title is to create additional incentives for students in high school to work harder on academic subjects and to prepare for college training. Recognition by the Federal Government of the importance of scholastic attainment in the form of scholarships to be earned on a competitive basis in itself should stimulate a stronger incentive on the part of more of our able students to continue their education beyond the high-school level.

TITLE III—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Description of the program

This title provides for Federal contributions to the capital of student loan funds to be administered by institutions of higher education. These funds will be used for long-term, low-interest loans to undergraduate and graduate students to enable them to continue their higher education. The Federal contribution will be a maximum of 80 percent of the capital funds and the institutional contribution a minimum of 20 percent, but the maximum Federal contribution to a single institution for any fiscal year is \$250,000. The program also provides for an institution to obtain Federal loans to finance its own capital share of the student loan fund.

Each loan program established at institutions of higher education upon their own application will be administered by the college or university in practically the same way that existing loan programs are administered at the present time. This procedure utilizes present machinery and also places the administration of the funds closer to the students who may need and apply for loans.

Loans to college students cannot exceed \$1,000 for a single academic year nor a total of \$5,000 to any one student. Loans will be made available to students who need them in order to continue their course of study subject to agreements entered into by colleges and universities and the Commissioner. The student will pay interest on the unpaid balance of his loan at 2 percent a year while in college and for the next year after he leaves school, and 4 percent a year for the next 10 years, during which time the loan must be paid off by the student. The student might, however, repay all or any part of his loan in less time than 10 years. Liability for repayment will be canceled upon death or permanent and total disability of the borrower.

Background

Based upon the returns of 1,746 colleges and universities in the Office of Education study of institutional student financial aid, 179 institutions (10.3 percent) reported no student aid in any form, i. e., no programs of undergraduate scholarships, graduate fellowships, student loans or employment. Among the colleges which submitted data concerning their programs, 704 (47.7 percent) lacked loan resources. It is estimated that this group of 883 colleges and universities which reported no available loan funds, enrolled approximately 30 percent of the Nation's total full-time college enrollment.

In recent months a number of colleges and universities have experienced a substantial increase in requests for loans as is indicated by

the following statement of December 10, 1957, from the University of Michigan News Service:

Demand for student loans at the University of Michigan is mounting at a recordbreaking rate. Loans approved since July 1 have jumped 45 percent over the corresponding period a year ago. This comes on top of a 40-percent increase in loans made during the year 1956-57 over the previous year 1955-56.

This report also included a canvass of the financial aid officers of Dartmouth, Indiana, Iowa State College, Purdue, State University of Iowa, the Universities of Colorado and Washington, and Wayne State University which revealed a similar situation with respect to applications for loans.

With respect to the demand for loans, George B. Risty, director of student financial aid, University of Minnesota, at the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor at Eau Claire, Wis., October 28, 1957, stated in part as follows:

In these years we have always had much greater demand for loan funds than we have for scholarships. Maybe it is because we lack some of the scholarship money and therefore we aren't able to help as many * * *. We have granted more loans than we have scholarships in all the years I have been there * * *. We are running through approximately 100 and some loans a week and it will run some over \$300,000 in this academic year.

Objectives

Effective use of larger loan fund resources will be a valuable supplement to other forms of student financial assistance and could materially reduce the serious problem of student dropouts.

The proposed Federal loan program will materially assist institutions of higher education to retain their more competent students who need financial assistance in order to continue their studies.

Based upon an average loan of \$600 per student, in the first year of the program approximately 83,000 students would receive assistance under this program, and during each of the next 3 years approximately 125,000 students would receive assistance under the program. Thereafter the program would be phased out until its termination on June 30, 1966.

These figures represent a considerable increase in the number of students who should be retained in colleges and universities with assistance provided under this title.

TITLE IV—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Description of program

This title authorizes grants to the States to assist over a period of 4 fiscal years in establishing and maintaining a 2-part program for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools, both administered in accordance with a single State plan for accomplishing the purposes of the program.

First, there is authorized the appropriation of \$60 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years for payments to State educational agencies for the acquisition of special equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in the public elementary and secondary schools of the State, and for minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such equipment.

Secondly, there is authorized the appropriation of \$5 million for each of the 4 years for payments to State educational agencies for the expansion or improvement of State supervision and related services in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction, and for the administration of the State plan.

The amounts appropriated for the acquisition of equipment and the remodeling of space will be allotted to the States on the basis of a formula reflecting relative school-age populations of the States and the relative income per school-age child. The sums appropriated to strengthen State supervision and leadership in these subjects and for the administration of the State plan will be allotted to the States on the basis of school-age population, but in no case will be less than \$20,000 for any State for any fiscal year. In each instance not in excess of 2 percent of the appropriated amounts for each year will be reserved by the Commissioner to make payments to the Territories and possessions of the United States, according to their needs, for the purposes of this program. The States' allotment for the acquisition of equipment and remodeling of space will be used to pay one-half of the expenditure for projects approved, and the States' allotment for supervisory and administrative services will likewise be used to pay one-half of the amount expended by the States, except during the first year of the program the Commissioner will pay for the full amount of the State expenditures for supervisory and administrative services.

Any State which desires to receive payments under this title is required to submit to the Commissioner of Education its State plan setting forth principally (1) a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment will be expended solely for local elementary and secondary school projects for acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audiovisual materials and equipment and printed materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages, and for minor remodeling of laboratory and other space used for such materials or equipment; (2) principles for determining the priority of such projects in the State for assistance under this title and provides for undertaking such projects, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles; (3) the establishment of standards on a State level for laboratory and other special equipment acquired with assistance furnished under this title; (4) a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment will be expended for (a) expansion or improvement of State supervisory and related programs in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and (b) administration of the State plan; and (5) provisions for administration of the program by the State educational agency, for necessary reports to the Commissioner, and for suitable fiscal control and accounting.

The Commissioner must approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of the act.

Background

There is no question as to the need for strengthening and expanding the teaching of mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages in our elementary and secondary schools. The vital importance of these subjects to our national defense and to the conduct of our foreign economic, cultural, and diplomatic relations is inescapable. Instruction in these subjects—utilizing modern techniques and equipment—must be adequate at the elementary and secondary school level if we are to produce the educated people our Nation needs in the years ahead. The plain cold fact is that these subjects are neglected ones in all too many of our schools today.

Subcommittee hearings revealed that during recent years most school districts throughout the country have been pressed with problems caused by increased enrollments, such as financing new construction and obtaining sufficient teaching personnel. As a result needs for adequate laboratory facilities, equipment and other teaching aids have been neglected. This, of course, has in many instances interfered with effective teaching in science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

There is need for modern laboratory equipment including audio-visual materials and equipment such as motion pictures, slides, filmstrips, transparencies, disk and tape recordings, still pictures, models, globes, charts, and maps in elementary and secondary schools if instruction and learning is to be improved.

Although there have been slight increases recently in the numbers of pupils studying science, analyses of program trends indicate a decreasing emphasis on laboratory experimentation by pupils. Steps must be taken to reverse this trend if theory and new knowledge is to be related to practice.

A survey for the school year 1957-58 revealed that only 60 high schools have electronic laboratory equipment for drill in hearing and speaking the foreign languages offered. Such equipment should be as much a part of a good school as the typing room, machine shop, or home economics room. An essential objective in foreign language study is a high level of competence in understanding the spoken language and in speaking. The conventional classroom does not provide adequately for the systematic oral practice which is indispensable in learning to speak a second language. Schools which have used electronic equipment for developing aural-oral skills report unanimously and enthusiastically in favor of the language laboratory.

Although adequate State leadership and supervisory service is widely recognized as vital to the development, maintenance and improvement of sound classroom instruction, only 2 States have full-time supervisors in mathematics; 6 States have full-time supervisors in mathematics and science; and only 2 States have supervisors in foreign language instruction.

Objectives

Under this title and dependent upon the determinations which are made by the State education agencies in developing their respective State plans, it is estimated that \$175 would be available for mathe-

matics and science equipment and related teaching facilities in each of 706,000 classrooms during the 4-year life of the legislation.

It is further estimated that during the same period, 10,000 classrooms could each be equipped with electronic equipment, tapes, and disks valued at \$500 for modern foreign language instruction.

In the area of science, it is estimated that 6,000 new and fully equipped general-science laboratories, 6,000 new biology laboratories, 1,500 new chemistry laboratories, and 1,200 new physics laboratories could be installed. During the same period, some 60,000 existing laboratories could be modernized by improving and extending laboratory equipment.

The States could also expend an average of \$25,000 each for science films and other audiovisual aids to be used in elementary and secondary schools, 22,000 public schools could receive funds for improving their reference libraries in mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages, and an estimated 10,000 schools could receive varying amounts of money for mathematics teaching aids.

These accomplishments would go far toward meeting the needs of State and local school systems—as determined by them—in providing sound instruction in mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages.

TITLE V—FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Description of the program

This title authorizes the Commissioner of Education to arrange, through contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced training in teaching modern foreign languages. This training is for teachers in elementary and secondary schools and higher education institutions. The contracts will be for summer institutes and for academic year institutes and will cover all or any part of the cost of the institutes as the Commissioner determines to be necessary. The Commissioner is also authorized to pay stipends to persons attending the institutes, including allowances for dependents and for travel to and from places of residence.

The Commissioner will also contract with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them of centers for instruction in languages now rarely taught in the United States and for instruction in other fields to provide a full understanding of the areas in which such languages are commonly spoken. He will determine the languages in which individuals should be trained in relation to the needs of the Federal Government or by business, industry, or education in the United States. The contracts will cover not more than 50 percent of the cost of establishing and operating a center. The Commissioner is also authorized to pay stipends to individuals taking training in foreign languages and with respect to which a center could be established, and the cost of travel in connection therewith of such persons and their dependents.

Institutions desiring to establish foreign language institutes and foreign language and area studies centers will submit to the Commissioner of Education applications, on prescribed forms, setting forth their plans in detail. Those plans that meet the requirements of the law and established regulations will be approved for financial assist-

ance insofar as funds are available. The Commissioner will then contract with the institution to provide the instruction.

The Commissioner is also authorized, directly or by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages and area studies, conduct research on methods of teaching the languages and related studies, and develop specialized materials for use in such training.

Background

As a Nation we are not prepared linguistically to exercise the full force of our leadership in the building of a peaceful world. Some 3 million Americans, including members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, are reported to be living, traveling, and working overseas each year. Few Americans available for overseas assignments have had any foreign language training. Most Americans who do study foreign languages start too late and stop too soon to become proficient in the use of the language.

Of the 24 languages of the world each spoken natively by more than 20 million persons, only Spanish and French are studied by any appreciable proportion of American high-school students. Of the total enrollment in grades 9 through 12 in the school year 1954-55, 7.3 percent of the students were enrolled in Spanish and 5.6 percent in French. Over half of our high schools offer no modern foreign languages at all, although many of these are, of course, the smaller schools.

On the basis of the latest available data (1954-55), less than 15 percent of the public high-school population was studying any modern foreign language. It is estimated that not more than 15 percent of the 3 million students enrolled in our colleges and universities are studying foreign languages. Although a movement is underway to encourage the teaching of modern foreign languages in the elementary schools, and while some progress is being made, it is estimated that less than 1 percent of the current elementary school enrollment is receiving training in foreign languages.

America can ill afford to let this situation continue. The U. S. S. R. is moving ahead rapidly in language instruction, and its emissaries to foreign nations are able to speak the languages of these nations. This is in marked contrast with the competence of most Americans in similar situations.

The number of college graduates prepared to teach who have majored in a foreign language declined from 2,193 in 1950 to 1,525 in 1957, a decline of about 30 percent. The national supply of new high-school teachers of foreign languages was reported as 25 percent short of the demand in 1956.

A number of foreign languages spoken by millions of people, such as Chinese, Arabic, Hindi, Farsi, Indonesian, and Swahili, are taught in only a very few centers in the United States. Today there are probably not more than 25 institutions of higher education in the Nation that are suitable for the establishment of either foreign language institutes or foreign language area studies centers.

Great advances have been made in recent years in the development of various electronic devices for language instruction. These need to be evaluated and continuous research and development are essential to reach new levels of efficiency in language instruction.

Objectives

This title of the bill will assist in extending and improving the instruction in foreign language in the United States. The foreign language institutes will improve both the knowledge and skill of the teachers of foreign languages in the elementary and secondary schools and the colleges and universities. It will help to emphasize competence in speaking those languages, and it will encourage the wider teaching of foreign languages at all levels of instruction. This title will also provide the means of preparing more Americans to conduct governmental, business, and cultural relations in an effective way. The language and area studies centers will play a significant role in developing a greater number of our citizens to represent effectively our varied interests in those countries of the world which speak languages that are rarely taught in the United States.

It is estimated that in fiscal year 1959, 8 summer institutes and 5 academic year institutes in foreign languages will be established and that stipends will be paid to 235 summer students and 250 academic year students. In succeeding years the number of institutes and the persons attending them will be increased to meet the need and demand for foreign language instruction. It is also estimated that during the year 6 foreign language training and area studies centers will be established and that stipends will be paid to 180 students. In succeeding years the number of centers will be approximately doubled and the number of persons in attendance will be substantially increased.

TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

Description of the program

The purpose of the title for the expansion of graduate education is to provide additional fellowships in the graduate schools of institutions of higher education for those individuals who are principally interested in teaching in colleges and universities. The expressed aim of the program is, in addition, to "further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation * * *." The program provides for the award of 1,000 fellowships for the first year and 1,500 for each of the 3 succeeding years. Fellowships can be retained for 2 years following the initial year of award.

Fellowship holders will receive a stipend of \$2,000 for the first academic year of study following the baccalaureate degree, \$2,200 for the second such year and \$2,400 for the third such year. An additional amount of \$400 for each such year will be awarded for each dependent of the fellowship holder.

Fellowships are to be awarded by the graduate schools of universities following approval of the Commissioner of Education based upon a finding that the graduate program of the university has been expanded or is a new program. On the basis of such finding, the Commissioner shall pay to the institution the sum of not less than \$500 or not more than \$2,500 per academic year which is determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of a new graduate program or the expansion of an existing graduate program which is reasonably

attributable to each fellowship authorized to be awarded by the approved institution.

Holders of fellowships will be required to maintain satisfactory academic standing and to devote essentially full time to study or research in the field in which the fellowship is awarded. Fellowship holders will not be permitted to engage in gainful employment other than part-time employment by the institution in teaching, research, or similar activity.

Background

One great need of the Nation is to increase the number of highly trained persons produced by the graduate schools of our universities. There is a special need to increase the number of graduates who will teach in the colleges and universities since today the number of persons with the degree of doctor of philosophy (the standard degree for college teachers) who enter teaching is decreasing. For example, a recent study found that among 829 colleges and universities in 1956 a total of 1,196 teaching positions remained unfilled. In 1953-54, 40 percent of all college teachers held doctoral degrees, but in this same year only 31 percent of new college teachers had such degrees. Three years later the latter figure had dropped to 23 percent, which represented a serious loss.

According to the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, no more than 5,000 of the 9,000 persons receiving doctoral degrees annually enter into college teaching as a career, and of these a considerable number are already engaged in teaching before receiving their doctorate. The President's Committee further expressed the view that "the cumulative deficit at the doctoral level is an alarming prospect." The President's Committee has estimated that from 15,000 to 22,500 new faculty members will be needed per year during the next 12 to 15 years.

Only some 160 institutions of higher education confer earned doctoral degrees. About 60 confer fewer than 10 degrees each and between 25 and 30 award more than 100 each. Thus, about 75 institutions conferring between 10 and 100 degrees provide a considerable potential for increasing the output of graduate doctoral degrees. With some financial assistance to these institutions and financial aid to graduate students, graduate education will be materially expanded.

Objectives

The number of fellowships awarded will be: 1,000 in fiscal year 1959; 1,500 in fiscal year 1960; 1,500 in fiscal year 1961; and 1,500 in fiscal year 1962. The number of additional persons receiving graduate training should be approximately 5,500 within the period of the program. After the graduation of the initial 1,000 fellows, 1,500 fellows will complete graduate courses each year.

TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

Description of the program

The program authorized by title VII is twofold. Appropriations of \$15 million for each of four succeeding fiscal years are authorized for grants to the States to enable the State educational agency in accordance with a State plan, to establish, maintain, and improve

programs of testing, counseling, and guidance in the secondary schools of the State. The Federal grants, allotted to the States on the basis of relative school-age populations, will equal the full cost of the State's programs for the first year and 50 percent of the cost of the programs for each of the three succeeding years. No State's allotment will be less than \$20,000 for any fiscal year. Not in excess of 2 percent of the total appropriation will be reserved by the Commissioner for the use of Territories and possessions for these purposes.

There is also authorized the appropriation of \$6 million for each of the 4 fiscal years to enable the Commissioner of Education to arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher education, for the establishment and operation of summer and regular session institutes for the training and upgrading of secondary school counseling and guidance personnel—with emphasis to be placed on the counseling and guidance of gifted students. The Commissioner is authorized to pay stipends to eligible public school personnel attending such institutes.

1. *State programs.*—Each State which desires to receive funds will submit a plan setting forth how the funds will be used to increase the effectiveness of testing, counseling, and guidance activities within the State. Since needs will vary from State to State, variation in plans is to be expected, but all will be geared to provide better testing, counseling, and guidance services for all secondary school students and particularly for the more able students.

Some possible utilization of the funds appropriated to States will be: (a) employing additional personnel at the State department of education level to increase the effectiveness of the services that can be provided to local school systems in testing, counseling, and guidance activities; and (b) making funds available to local school systems for employing personnel in the testing, counseling, and guidance programs.

2. *Institutes.*—Institutions of higher education with programs for the training of testing, counseling, and guidance personnel will be invited to submit a plan for the operation of the institutes. Taking geographical needs into account, those institutions best equipped and most proficient to perform the training mission will be selected.

Enrollees for the institutes will be selected from persons employed or to be employed in full- or part-time guidance and counseling capacities in public school systems. The selection and number of persons to attend each institute will be determined by the institution of higher education operating the institute. However, it is expected that appropriate measures will be employed to assure that the personnel needs, to the extent possible, for all States will be met.

Funds will be used to—

(a) Defray the cost of additional administrative, teaching, and clerical personnel.

(b) Cover the cost of additional supplies and equipment needed for the operation of the institutes.

(c) Pay stipends to eligible institute enrollees and dependents.

Background

It is a well known fact that we have in this Nation a serious loss of talent because many students who could benefit by further education drop out of school short of reaching their optimum level of achievement. Even more disturbing is the waste which occurs among the

more able students. Approximately one-half of all high ability students fail to complete a level of educational attainment commensurate with their abilities. It is also known that adequate testing, counseling, and guidance can make significant contributions to the identification and educational development of all high school students, but particularly those in the more able category.

It is estimated that not more than one-half of the high-school students in the Nation are provided with the services of a well-rounded counseling program. Contributing to this situation is a severe shortage of qualified guidance personnel. While there is wide variation from school to school and from State to State in the distribution of counseling personnel employed, in the extent of counselor preparation, and in the number of students which each counselor must serve, altogether the Nation's schools now employ approximately 26,000 counselors, including both full-time and part-time personnel. However, in terms of full-time equivalents, there are only approximately 11,000. The best current estimates put the need at approximately 15,000 additional counselors in the public high schools alone, if these services are to be provided on an adequate basis.

A total of 41 States employ some personnel charged with counseling and guidance responsibilities. However, the State departments at this time generally are not staffed sufficiently to provide the professional leadership, consultative services, research, and publications which are required to promote the necessary expansion and improvement of guidance services in the local schools. The 41 State programs employ a total of only 63 persons, counting both full-time and part-time personnel, who are responsible for giving professional leadership for these services.

Objectives

Title VII should assist materially in achieving the following results:

(a) Providing at least a minimum testing program in all States for all public secondary school students at two or more grade levels.

(b) Providing, at the State department of education level, for approximately 450 new professional positions (distributed among the States) for administration and supervision in this field.

(c) Enabling all State departments of education to sponsor special in-service training workshops for key persons in counseling and guidance.

(d) Providing at the local school level for approximately 2,000 new positions in counseling and guidance.

(e) Providing for approximately 60 institutes in guidance and counseling annually and training (1) 735 persons per year for 1 year, (2) 1,000 persons per year for 6 weeks, and (3) 620 persons per year for 3 weeks.

TITLE VIII.—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Description of the program

The program contemplates that the Commissioner, either through grants or contracts, shall make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved utilization of communications media

for educational purposes and shall conduct research demonstrations and experiments in the use of such media and in the use of new media of communication. The Commissioner shall further evaluate and publish reports concerning the effectiveness of such media and may prepare and publish abstracts and catalogs of materials available for teaching purposes.

The foregoing activities will be utilized as a basis for providing upon request advice, counsel, and technical assistance to State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize such media of communications in providing education.

It is expected that the program of research studies and demonstrations authorized herein shall be conducted by the Commissioner in a manner similar to the administration of programs of research surveys and demonstrations authorized by Public Law 531, 83d Congress.

Background

The need for this title is emphasized by the fact that, as a result of the vast increases in man's knowledge and the growing complexity of modern life, education has become one of the major concerns in the world today, and it represents perhaps the greatest hope of mankind for a better life. Every citizen is concerned with the improvement of education, either directly or indirectly. The use of mass media for education is one avenue for such improvement which merits further exploration. It is possible that television, radio, motion pictures, and other media can be developed as modern tools for education much as the microscope, the telescope, and the cyclotron have been developed into the marvelously complex and efficient tools of modern science.

However, before it is assumed that these mediums can be used as educational tools, there is need for extensive and careful experimentation to determine how effective they are and how they may best be utilized. Under the program the Office of Education will be in a position to assess the technical advances which have been made in the use of mass media and determine how these advances may best be utilized for educational purposes. This will include (1) an examination of the different types of content or subject matter which may be most suitable for such presentation, (2) the methods which may be adapted for teaching via TV or radio, (3) an exploration of the quality of education as presented through the mass mediums compared with direct teaching, and (4) some assessment of the effectiveness of mass mediums as compared with present practices in communicating educational information to the general public.

Objectives

The program should result in an overall attack on the problem of utilizing mass mediums in the educational process. First of all, it will provide an evaluation of what has already been accomplished through the efforts of the numerous public and private agencies which have pioneered in this work. Second, it will identify the directions which seem most likely to prove fruitful in future study and experimentation. Third, and most important of all, it will produce scientific evidence about the efficacy of utilizing mass mediums in education for the use of all those concerned with education—both professionally and as citizens—and for making plans for the further development of our educational system.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

This title contains various miscellaneous provisions covering method of payments, allotments to Territories and possessions, advisory committees, and judicial review. The only program authorized in this title is set forth in section 902.

Description of the program

Under section 902 the Commissioner of Education will, upon submission of a State plan, make grants to the States for the purpose of assisting the States to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of educational statistics and the methods and techniques for collecting and processing educational data and disseminating information about the condition and progress of education in the States. The grants cover one-half the cost of State educational agency programs carried out under the State plan, but cannot exceed \$50,000 in any State for any of the 4 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

The State plan must set forth the new, additional, or expanded programs proposed to meet its needs and provide the general overall pattern that a State will follow in improving the statistical services of its State educational agency. The purposes of programs outlined in the State plan may include (1) improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of statistical data supplied by local educational units, (2) the development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve as guides for local educational units, (3) the conduct of conferences and training for personnel of local educational units and periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for records and reports, (4) improving methods for obtaining, from other State agencies within the State, educational data not collected by the State educational agency, or (5) expediting the processing and reporting of statistical data through installation and operation of mechanical equipment.

Background

It is extremely important to private citizens, organizations, educators, and to officials at every level of government who are working to improve the quality of education in the United States that they have adequate, reliable, and timely information concerning American education. The demands for information to show the condition and progress, the strengths and the weaknesses, of education throughout the Nation are continually expanding, and have become increasingly urgent as the vital importance of our educational system to the national defense and security is better appreciated.

In its second report to the President, of July 22, 1957, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School reported that:

We have been struck above all else by the astounding lack of accurate, consistent, and up-to-date facts, and by how little this Nation knows about its enormously vital and expensive educational enterprise in contrast to how much it knows, in great detail, about agriculture, industry, labor, banking and other areas. * * * Until the gross deficiencies in educational reporting are remedied, all advisory work, all research, all educational planning throughout the country

and all efforts by individual States, communities, and institutions to devise effective actions will be severely handicapped.

In considering proposals for remedying this situation, the Committee recognized that State educational agencies occupy a key spot in the total picture. The United States Office of Education, which is charged with the responsibility for compiling information and data on American education and disseminating it broadly across the Nation, relies heavily upon State educational agencies for necessary data. At the same time, heavy demands for information are made by agencies, organizations, and individuals within the States. Shortages of staff and suitable equipment in State educational agencies make it impossible for them to keep abreast of these constant State and national demands which are made on them for educational data. The program of Federal assistance authorized by section 902 should go far toward improving this situation and insuring that our needs for information are met.

Objectives

Briefly stated, the following results may be expected from the program:

(a) United States Office of Education requests for data could be handled more promptly and obtain more widespread coverage than is now possible.

(b) Educational information will be made available on a speeded-up schedule to meet local, State, and national demands for more current data.

(c) The quality of educational information dealing with finance, property, and personnel will be improved throughout the Nation.

(d) Responsible officials at all levels of Government and the public will have facts not now available on which to base decisions regarding the educational program.

(e) The quantity of educational information could be adjusted to demands for data instead of being dependent, as it now is, largely upon inadequate personnel or facilities for collecting or processing.

(f) Research which has been hampered or prevented by lack of adequate educational data could be conducted.

(g) The comparability of educational information will be improved throughout the country so that such terms as school costs, school building costs, and number of teachers will have a more uniform meaning.

Allocations under H. R. 13247, fiscal year ending June 30, 1959

Region and State	Title II— National defense scholarships	Title III— Loans to students in institutions of higher education	Title IV—Grants for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language in- struction in public schools		Title VII, pt. A— Guidance, counseling, testing, iden- tification, and encour- agement of able students
			Part relating to \$60,000,000 for acqui- sition of equipment	Part relating to the ex- pansion or im- prove- ment of supervision	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Aggregate United States....	\$17,500,000	\$40,000,000	\$60,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$15,000,000
Continental United States....	17,150,000	39,667,233	58,800,000	4,900,000	14,700,000
Northeast:					
Connecticut.....	188,655	554,738	482,574	59,077	178,990
Maine.....	103,172	152,390	396,130	27,344	82,845
Massachusetts.....	421,529	1,664,536	1,177,261	126,308	382,682
New Hampshire.....	53,059	164,365	199,479	20,000	47,503
New Jersey.....	474,588	716,318	1,181,350	144,620	438,165
New York.....	1,376,598	4,156,280	3,347,267	409,778	1,241,532
Pennsylvania.....	1,117,195	2,361,279	3,367,533	299,023	905,972
Rhode Island.....	70,746	211,701	225,086	21,825	66,124
Vermont.....	41,269	133,440	165,387	20,000	33,822
North Central:					
Illinois.....	884,324	2,038,119	2,107,179	254,748	771,824
Indiana.....	456,902	1,162,382	1,573,544	129,443	392,182
Iowa.....	360,670	759,806	1,096,658	79,648	241,314
Kansas.....	209,291	650,052	780,424	59,454	180,130
Michigan.....	792,945	1,704,121	2,413,606	223,767	677,959
Minnesota.....	338,990	900,997	1,323,404	97,083	294,137
Missouri.....	421,529	947,119	1,339,174	113,765	344,680
Nebraska.....	153,282	381,751	549,220	40,138	121,607
North Dakota.....	79,589	168,326	336,123	20,570	62,324
Ohio.....	893,167	1,825,092	2,677,642	257,005	778,664
South Dakota.....	79,589	182,500	345,745	21,198	64,224
Wisconsin.....	400,893	903,081	1,413,476	110,253	334,039
South:					
Alabama.....	421,529	590,836	1,742,098	106,615	323,018
Arkansas.....	235,821	317,020	959,184	58,701	177,850
Delaware.....	41,269	77,711	93,238	20,000	34,582
Florida.....	356,677	709,704	1,342,925	105,110	318,458
Georgia.....	456,902	655,263	2,020,827	123,674	374,701
Kentucky.....	386,156	516,479	1,612,955	98,713	299,077
Louisiana.....	353,730	700,836	1,629,370	99,717	302,117
Maryland.....	268,244	543,501	906,770	81,655	247,394
Mississippi.....	309,513	438,125	1,235,854	75,634	229,153
North Carolina.....	574,811	921,443	2,402,017	147,004	445,385
Oklahoma.....	265,297	732,478	1,030,288	67,857	205,592
South Carolina.....	312,460	437,116	1,367,026	83,662	253,474
Tennessee.....	421,529	734,550	1,781,016	108,598	330,239
Texas.....	949,174	2,297,432	4,009,192	278,203	842,888
Virginia.....	403,842	644,159	1,678,279	112,887	342,020
West Virginia.....	271,193	352,038	1,076,000	65,851	192,511
District of Columbia.....	58,956	475,170	138,335	20,000	51,303
West:					
Arizona.....	126,752	264,701	517,096	34,995	106,026
California.....	1,108,352	3,811,329	2,965,194	362,993	1,099,783
Colorado.....	162,125	540,772	607,936	47,538	144,028
Idaho.....	76,642	152,067	328,991	20,696	62,704
Montana.....	67,799	156,994	271,567	20,194	61,183
Nevada.....	23,583	29,087	57,363	20,000	21,281
New Mexico.....	100,223	166,582	471,384	28,849	87,405
Oregon.....	165,075	489,287	619,618	50,172	152,009
Utah.....	100,223	403,068	444,147	28,096	85,125
Washington.....	241,715	703,811	865,700	77,139	233,713
Wyoming.....	32,426	64,181	127,268	20,000	29,262
Outlying parts of the United States.....	1 350,000	332,767	1 1,200,000	1 100,000	1 300,000
Alaska.....		8,982			
Canal Zone.....		2,880			
Guam.....		1,137			
Puerto Rico.....		223,335			
Territory of Hawaii.....		96,433			

¹ 2 percent of allocation to the aggregate United States reserved for allocation to the outlying parts of the United States.

Allocations under title II of H. R. 13247, fiscal year ending June 30, 1959

Region and State	Estimate of civilian population aged 18 through 21, July 1, 1956, continental United States ¹					Title II—National defense scholarships: Allocation to States of \$17,500,000 for scholarships for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 ²
	21 years and over	18 years and over	18 years and over less 21 years and over (col. 3—col. 2)	1/3 of col. 4 used as estimate of 21 years of age	Estimated 18 through 21 years (col. 4+col. 5)	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Aggregate United States.....						\$17,500,000
Continental United States.....	\$ 102,147,000	\$ 107,965,000	5,818,000	1,939,336	7,757,336	17,150,000
Northeast:						
Connecticut.....	1,444,000	1,508,000	64,000	21,333	85,333	188,655
Maine.....	562,000	597,000	35,000	11,667	46,667	103,172
Massachusetts.....	3,111,000	3,254,000	143,000	47,667	190,667	421,529
New Hampshire.....	357,000	375,000	18,000	6,000	24,000	53,059
New Jersey.....	3,606,000	3,767,000	161,000	53,667	214,667	474,588
New York.....	10,459,000	10,926,000	467,000	155,667	622,667	1,376,588
Pennsylvania.....	7,029,000	7,408,000	379,000	126,333	505,333	1,117,195
Rhode Island.....	534,000	558,000	24,000	8,000	32,000	70,746
Vermont.....	226,000	240,000	14,000	4,667	18,667	41,269
North Central:						
Illinois.....	6,094,000	6,394,000	300,000	100,000	400,000	884,324
Indiana.....	2,729,000	2,884,000	155,000	51,667	206,667	456,902
Iowa.....	1,710,000	1,812,000	102,000	34,000	136,000	300,670
Kansas.....	1,272,000	1,343,000	71,000	23,667	94,667	209,291
Michigan.....	4,594,000	4,863,000	269,000	89,667	358,667	792,945
Minnesota.....	1,983,000	2,098,000	115,000	38,333	153,333	338,990
Missouri.....	2,677,000	2,820,000	143,000	47,667	190,667	421,529
Nebraska.....	882,000	934,000	52,000	17,333	69,333	153,282
North Dakota.....	369,000	396,000	27,000	9,000	36,000	79,589
Ohio.....	5,656,000	5,959,000	303,000	101,000	404,000	893,167
South Dakota.....	405,000	432,000	27,000	9,000	36,000	79,589
Wisconsin.....	2,335,000	2,471,000	136,000	45,333	181,333	400,893
South:						
Alabama.....	1,740,000	1,883,000	143,000	47,667	190,667	421,529
Arkansas.....	1,003,000	1,083,000	80,000	26,667	106,667	235,821
Delaware.....	256,000	270,000	14,000	4,667	18,667	41,269
Florida.....	2,411,000	2,532,000	121,000	40,333	161,333	356,677
Georgia.....	2,044,000	2,199,000	155,000	51,667	206,667	456,902
Kentucky.....	1,718,000	1,849,000	131,000	43,667	174,667	386,156
Louisiana.....	1,665,000	1,785,000	120,000	40,000	160,000	353,730
Maryland.....	1,694,000	1,785,000	91,000	30,333	121,333	268,244
Mississippi.....	1,155,000	1,260,000	105,000	35,000	140,000	309,513
North Carolina.....	2,434,000	2,629,000	195,000	65,000	260,000	574,811
Oklahoma.....	1,356,000	1,446,000	90,000	30,000	120,000	265,297
South Carolina.....	1,204,000	1,310,000	106,000	35,333	141,333	312,460
Tennessee.....	2,009,000	2,152,000	143,000	47,667	190,667	421,529
Texas.....	5,121,000	5,443,000	322,000	107,333	429,333	949,174
Virginia.....	2,071,000	2,208,000	137,000	45,667	182,667	403,842
West Virginia.....	1,141,000	1,233,000	92,000	30,667	122,667	271,193
District of Columbia.....	564,000	584,000	20,000	6,667	26,667	58,956
West:						
Arizona.....	597,000	640,000	43,000	14,333	57,333	126,752
California.....	8,379,000	8,755,000	376,000	125,333	501,333	1,108,352
Colorado.....	954,000	1,009,000	55,000	18,333	73,333	162,125
Idaho.....	353,000	379,000	26,000	8,667	34,667	76,642
Montana.....	384,000	407,000	23,000	7,667	30,667	67,799
Nevada.....	153,000	161,000	8,000	2,667	10,667	23,583
New Mexico.....	406,000	440,000	34,000	11,333	45,333	100,223
Oregon.....	1,079,000	1,135,000	56,000	18,667	74,667	165,075
Utah.....	443,000	477,000	34,000	11,333	45,333	100,223
Washington.....	1,602,000	1,684,000	82,000	27,333	109,333	241,715
Wyoming.....	177,000	188,000	11,000	3,667	14,667	32,426
Outlying parts of the United States.....						\$350,000

¹ Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Populations Reports, Series P-25, No. 172.

² Col. 7 computed as $2.210810515 \text{ times col. 6. } 2.210810515 = \frac{17,150,000}{7,757,336}$.

³ Sum of rounded figures.

⁴ 2 percent of allocation to the aggregate United States reserved for allocation to the outlying parts of the United States.

Allocations under title III of H. R. 13247, fiscal year ending June 30, 1959

Region and State	Title III loans to students in institutions of higher education		Region and State	Title III loans to students in institutions of higher education	
	Under-graduate resident, full-time enrollment and graduate enrollment in institutions of higher education: November 1955 ¹	Allocations to States, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 ²		Under-graduate resident, full-time enrollment and graduate enrollment in institutions of higher education: November 1955 ¹	Allocations to States, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 ²
(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
Aggregate United States.....	\$2,110,907	\$40,000,000	South—Continued		
Northeast:			Louisiana.....	\$36,985	\$700,836
Connecticut.....	29,275	554,738	Maryland.....	28,682	543,501
Maine.....	8,042	152,390	Mississippi.....	23,121	438,125
Massachusetts.....	87,842	1,664,533	North Carolina.....	48,627	921,443
New Hampshire.....	8,674	164,365	Oklahoma.....	38,734	733,978
New Jersey.....	37,802	716,318	South Carolina.....	23,110	437,916
New York.....	219,333	4,156,280	Tennessee.....	38,780	734,850
Pennsylvania.....	124,611	2,361,279	Texas.....	121,263	2,297,932
Rhode Island.....	11,172	211,701	Virginia.....	33,994	644,159
Vermont.....	7,042	133,440	West Virginia.....	18,578	352,038
Illinois.....	107,557	2,038,119	District of Columbia.....	25,076	475,170
Indiana.....	61,342	1,162,382	West:		
Iowa.....	40,097	759,806	Arizona.....	13,969	264,701
Kansas.....	34,305	650,052	California.....	201,134	3,811,329
Michigan.....	89,931	1,704,121	Colorado.....	28,538	540,772
Minnesota.....	47,548	900,937	Idaho.....	8,025	152,067
Missouri.....	49,932	947,119	Montana.....	8,285	156,994
Nebraska.....	20,146	381,751	Nevada.....	1,535	29,087
North Dakota.....	8,833	168,323	New Mexico.....	8,791	166,532
Ohio.....	96,315	1,825,092	Oregon.....	25,821	489,237
South Dakota.....	9,631	182,500	Utah.....	21,271	403,068
Wisconsin.....	47,658	903,081	Washington.....	37,142	703,811
South:			Wyoming.....	3,387	64,131
Alabama.....	31,180	590,836	Outlying parts of the United States:		
Arkansas.....	16,730	317,020	Alaska.....	474	8,982
Delaware.....	4,101	77,711	Canal Zone.....	152	2,830
Florida.....	37,453	709,704	Guam.....	60	1,137
Georgia.....	34,580	655,263	Puerto Rico.....	11,786	223,335
Kentucky.....	27,256	516,479	Virgin Islands.....	(4)	-----
			Territory of Hawaii.....	5,089	96,433

¹ Source: Office of Education Circular 493, Resident and Extension Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education, November 1955.

² Computed as $18.94920051 \times \text{col. 2} = \frac{40,000,000}{2,110,907}$.

³ Excludes United States service schools.

⁴ No institutions of higher education.

*Allocations under title IV of H. R. 13247, fiscal year ending June 30, 1959—
Title IV, grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern
foreign language instruction in public schools part relating to \$60,000,000 for
acquisition of equipment*

Region and State	Average personal income per child of school age (5-17) 1954-56 ¹	Calculation of allotment ratio		School-age population (ages 5-17) July 1, 1956 ² (thou- sands) ³	State product, col. 4×col. 5	Appropri- ation of \$60,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 ⁴
		1st step, col. 2×5 ¹ 8,152 ²	100 less col. 3 allotment restricted to 33.33- 66.67 ³			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Aggregate United States.....						\$60,000,000
Continental United States.....	\$8,152			38,682	\$1,912,749	58,800,000
Northeast:						
Connecticut.....	12,166	74.62	33.33	471	15,698	482,574
Maine.....	6,667	40.89	59.11	218	12,883	396,130
Massachusetts.....	10,104	61.97	38.03	1,007	38,293	1,177,261
New Hampshire.....	7,841	48.09	51.91	125	6,489	199,479
New Jersey.....	11,305	69.34	33.33	1,153	38,429	1,181,359
New York.....	11,526	70.69	33.33	3,267	108,889	3,347,367
Pennsylvania.....	8,813	54.05	45.95	2,384	109,545	3,367,533
Rhode Island.....	9,444	57.92	42.08	174	7,322	225,085
Vermont.....	6,449	39.55	60.45	89	5,330	165,387
North Central:						
Illinois.....	10,802	66.25	33.75	2,031	68,546	2,107,179
Indiana.....	8,218	50.40	49.60	1,032	51,187	1,573,544
Iowa.....	7,145	43.82	56.18	635	35,674	1,096,658
Kansas.....	7,572	46.44	53.56	474	25,387	780,424
Michigan.....	9,128	55.99	44.01	1,784	78,514	2,413,606
Minnesota.....	7,235	44.38	55.62	774	43,050	1,323,404
Missouri.....	8,474	51.97	48.03	907	43,563	1,339,174
Nebraska.....	7,202	44.17	55.83	320	17,866	549,220
North Dakota.....	5,181	31.78	66.67	164	10,934	336,123
Ohio.....	9,373	57.49	42.51	2,049	87,103	2,677,642
South Dakota.....	5,453	33.45	66.55	169	11,247	345,745
Wisconsin.....	7,776	47.69	52.31	879	45,980	1,413,476
South:						
Alabama.....	4,265	26.16	66.67	850	56,670	1,742,098
Arkansas.....	3,929	24.10	66.67	468	31,202	959,184
Delaware.....	12,216	74.93	33.33	91	3,033	93,238
Florida.....	7,804	47.87	52.13	838	43,685	1,342,925
Georgia.....	5,016	30.77	66.67	983	65,737	2,020,827
Kentucky.....	4,859	29.80	66.67	787	52,469	1,612,955
Louisiana.....	5,220	32.02	66.67	795	53,003	1,623,370
Maryland.....	8,917	54.69	45.31	651	29,497	906,770
Mississippi.....	3,257	20.04	66.67	603	40,202	1,235,854
North Carolina.....	4,701	28.83	66.67	1,172	78,137	2,402,017
Oklahoma.....	6,203	38.05	61.95	541	33,515	1,030,288
South Carolina.....	3,889	23.85	66.67	667	44,469	1,397,025
Tennessee.....	5,095	30.70	66.67	839	57,933	1,781,016
Texas.....	6,718	41.20	58.80	2,218	130,418	4,003,192
Virginia.....	6,414	39.34	60.66	900	54,594	1,678,279
West Virginia.....	4,884	29.96	66.67	525	35,002	1,076,000
District of Columbia.....	14,788	90.70	33.33	135	4,500	138,335
West:						
Arizona.....	6,475	39.71	60.29	279	16,821	517,096
California.....	11,097	67.51	33.33	2,894	96,457	2,965,194
Colorado.....	7,797	47.82	52.18	379	19,776	607,936
Idaho.....	5,730	35.14	64.86	165	10,702	328,991
Montana.....	7,358	45.13	54.87	161	8,834	271,567
Nevada.....	11,326	69.47	33.33	56	1,866	57,363
New Mexico.....	5,163	31.67	66.67	230	15,334	471,384
Oregon.....	8,088	49.61	50.39	400	20,156	619,618
Utah.....	5,788	35.50	64.50	224	14,448	444,147
Washington.....	8,839	54.21	45.79	615	28,161	865,700
Wyoming.....	7,539	46.24	53.76	77	4,140	127,268
Outlying parts of the United States.....						⁵ 1,200,000

¹ Source: School-age population from Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25. Personal income from Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, August 1957.

² Col. 3 for each State, including District of Columbia, computed as the product of 50 and the quotient obtained by dividing the figure in col. 2 by 8,152.

³ Col. 4 computed as 100 less the figure in col. 3. Values less than 33½ are raised to 33½, and values more than 66½ are reduced to 66½.

⁴ Col. 7 computed as 30.74109567 times the figure in col. 6. 30.74109567=58,800,000/1,912,749.

⁵ The "allotment ratio" for the District of Columbia is computed on the same basis as for all the other States (resulting in 33.33 percentum rather than 50 percent as specified in certain versions of the bill).

⁶ 2 percent of allocation to the aggregate United States reserved for allocation to the outlying parts of the United States.

Allocations under title IV of H. R. 13247, fiscal year ending June 30, 1959—Title IV, grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools; part relating to the expansion or improvement of supervision

Region and State	School-age population (5-17 years of age) July 1, 1956 (thousands) ¹	Tentative allocation to States for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 ²	Allocation with a floor of \$20,000 for each State ³
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Aggregate United States.....		\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
Continental United States.....	38,682	4,900,000	4,900,000
Northeast:			
Connecticut.....	471	59,663	59,077
Maine.....	218	27,615	27,344
Massachusetts.....	1,007	127,561	126,308
New Hampshire.....	125	15,834	20,000
New Jersey.....	1,153	146,055	144,620
New York.....	3,267	413,844	409,778
Pennsylvania.....	2,384	301,991	299,023
Rhode Island.....	174	22,041	21,825
Vermont.....	89	11,274	20,000
North Central:			
Illinois.....	2,031	257,275	254,748
Indiana.....	1,032	130,727	129,443
Iowa.....	635	80,438	79,643
Kansas.....	474	60,043	59,454
Michigan.....	1,784	225,986	223,767
Minnesota.....	774	98,046	97,083
Missouri.....	907	114,893	113,765
Nebraska.....	320	40,536	40,138
North Dakota.....	164	20,775	20,570
Ohio.....	2,049	259,555	257,005
South Dakota.....	169	21,408	21,198
Wisconsin.....	879	111,346	110,253
South:			
Alabama.....	850	107,673	106,615
Arkansas.....	468	59,283	58,701
Delaware.....	91	11,527	20,000
Florida.....	838	106,153	105,110
Georgia.....	986	124,900	123,674
Kentucky.....	787	99,692	98,713
Louisiana.....	795	100,706	99,717
Maryland.....	651	82,465	81,655
Mississippi.....	603	76,384	75,634
North Carolina.....	1,172	148,462	147,004
Oklahoma.....	541	68,531	67,857
South Carolina.....	667	84,491	83,662
Tennessee.....	869	110,080	108,998
Texas.....	2,218	280,963	278,203
Virginia.....	900	114,007	112,887
West Virginia.....	525	66,504	65,851
District of Columbia.....	135	17,101	20,000
West:			
Arizona.....	279	35,342	34,995
California.....	2,894	366,594	362,993
Colorado.....	379	48,009	47,538
Idaho.....	165	20,901	20,696
Montana.....	161	20,394	20,194
Nevada.....	56	7,094	20,000
New Mexico.....	230	29,135	28,849
Oregon.....	400	50,670	50,172
Utah.....	224	28,375	28,096
Washington.....	615	77,904	77,139
Wyoming.....	77	9,754	20,000
Outlying parts of the United States.....		⁴ 100,000	⁴ 100,000

¹ Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 172.

² Col. 3 computed as $126.6739052 \text{ times figures in col. 2} = \frac{4,900,000}{38,682}$.

³ Col. 4 computed by assigning \$20,000 to each of 6 States which are less than \$20,000 as computed in col. 3. The \$4,780,000 remaining for the other 43 States is distributed proportionately to school-age population by multiplying the figure in col. 2 by 125.4296885 for these 43 States thus reducing their allocations proportionately. $125.4296885 = \frac{4,780,000}{38,109}$, 38,109 being the school-age population (thousands) in the 43 States concerned.

⁴ 2 percent of allocation to the aggregate United States reserved for allocation to the outlying parts of the United States.

*Allocations under title VII of H. R. 13247, fiscal year ending June 30, 1959—
Title VII, guidance, counseling, testing, identification, and encouragement of able
students—Pt. A, State programs*

Region and State	School-age population (5-17 years of age) July 1, 1956 (thou- sands) ¹	Allocation to States for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 ²	Region and State	School-age population (5-17 years of age) July 1, 1956 (thou- sands) ¹	Allocation to States for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 ²
Aggregate United States.....		\$15,000,000	South—Continued		
Continental United States.....	38,682	14,700,000	Arkansas.....	468	\$177,850
Northeast:			Delaware.....	91	34,582
Connecticut.....	471	178,990	Florida.....	838	318,458
Maine.....	218	82,845	Georgia.....	986	374,701
Massachusetts.....	1,007	382,682	Kentucky.....	787	299,077
New Hampshire.....	125	47,503	Louisiana.....	795	302,117
New Jersey.....	1,153	438,165	Maryland.....	651	247,394
New York.....	3,267	1,241,532	Mississippi.....	603	229,153
Pennsylvania.....	2,384	905,972	North Carolina.....	1,172	445,385
Rhode Island.....	174	66,124	Oklahoma.....	541	205,592
Vermont.....	89	33,822	South Carolina.....	667	253,474
North Central:			Tennessee.....	869	330,239
Illinois.....	2,031	771,824	Texas.....	2,218	842,888
Indiana.....	1,032	392,182	Virginia.....	900	342,020
Iowa.....	635	241,314	West Virginia.....	525	199,511
Kansas.....	474	180,130	District of Columbia.....	135	51,303
Michigan.....	1,784	677,959	West:		
Minnesota.....	774	294,137	Arizona.....	279	106,026
Missouri.....	907	344,680	California.....	2,894	1,099,783
Nebraska.....	320	121,607	Colorado.....	379	144,028
North Dakota.....	164	62,324	Idaho.....	165	62,704
Ohio.....	2,049	778,664	Montana.....	161	61,183
South Dakota.....	169	64,224	Nevada.....	56	21,281
Wisconsin.....	879	334,039	New Mexico.....	230	87,405
South:			Oregon.....	400	152,009
Alabama.....	850	323,018	Utah.....	224	85,125
			Washington.....	615	233,713
			Wyoming.....	77	29,262
			Outlying parts of the United States.....		³ 300,000

¹ Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 172.

² Col. 3 computed as $3800217155 \text{ times figures in col. 2. } 3800217155 = \frac{14,700,000}{38,682}$.

³ 2 percent of allocation to the aggregate United States reserved for allocation to the outlying parts of the United States.

SECTION-BY-SECTION DESCRIPTION OF BILL

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 101—Findings and declaration of policy

This section contains the congressional findings and declaration of policy.

Section 102—Federal control of education prohibited

This section states that nothing contained in the act will be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution. The committee believes the inclusion of this provision in the bill will serve to give an added measure of assurance that no Federal control of an educational institution or school system can result through misinterpretation of this act.

Section 103—Definitions

This section provides definitions of the terms listed below to be used for the purposes of the act. In this section-by-section description of the bill these terms will be used in their defined sense.

(1) "State" is defined generally to mean the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. An exception is made with respect to the Territories and possessions mentioned in the case of certain sections under which they receive special treatment in computing allotments of funds.

(2) "Institution of higher education" is defined, generally speaking, to include junior colleges, colleges, and universities. Specifically, to be an institution of higher education in the defined sense a school must admit as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, be legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond the secondary level, provide an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provide not less than a 2-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, be a public or other nonprofit institution, and be accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or if not so accredited, be an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. To be an institution of higher education in the defined sense, an institution must be located in a State (as defined), except that for the title which provides for scholarships, an institution in a foreign country will be an institution of higher education which may be attended by a scholarship holder if the Commissioner determines it to be substantially comparable to an institution which would qualify as an institution of higher education if located in a State. For the purposes of the scholarship title and the loan title, the term includes any private business school or technical institution which meets the provisions outlined above. The Commissioner will publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he finds to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(3) "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the governor or by State law.

(4) "School-age population" means the population between 5 and 17, both inclusive.

(5) "Resident" will be defined by the Commissioner; however, his regulations must provide that persons domiciled in a legal sense in a State but living outside of any State (as defined) will be deemed to be residing in the State of their domicile.

(6) "Elementary school" and "secondary school" are defined to mean a public school providing elementary or secondary education, as the case may be, as determined under State law, except that no education provided beyond the 12th grade will be included in the term "secondary school."

(7) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education, and the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(8) "State commission" means the State agency designated or created to participate in a program under the scholarship title.

(9) The terms "local educational agency," "nonprofit," and "public" are each defined in a manner not inconsistent with the generally understood meaning of such terms.

TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

Section 201—Appropriations authorized

This section authorizes the appropriation of funds to award scholarships during this and the next 3 fiscal years to be paid the student over the period of his undergraduate studies. The amount authorized is \$17,500,000 for this and each of the next 3 fiscal years for paying scholarships to persons who are awarded scholarships under the title during each such year. In addition the section authorizes the appropriation of sufficient funds to make payments to students who were awarded national defense scholarships in prior years. Thus, new scholarships will be awarded during this and the next 3 fiscal years to be paid students during the course of their undergraduate studies. Scholarships awarded under the title will be known as "national defense scholarships."

Section 202—Amount of scholarships

Every person who is awarded a national defense scholarship will receive at least \$500 during each academic year of the scholarship's duration. In addition the State commission will determine scholarship holders to be paid an additional amount, not exceeding \$500, during each academic year. The additional payment will be the amount the State commission determines the student needs in order to attend an institution of higher education during the academic year.

Section 203—Duration of scholarships

Scholarships awarded under this title will normally be for 4 years, except that where the time required to complete the student's curriculum is more than 4 years—as, for example, in some engineering courses—the scholarship will continue until the student finishes his course. In no event, however, will a student's scholarship continue after the completion of the work for his first bachelor's degree.

Scholarship holders will be entitled to receive their scholarships only while they are devoting essentially full time to educational work leading to a bachelor's degree, during the academic year, in attendance at an institution of higher education. A student who is carrying a full-time load at an educational institution would be considered as devoting essentially full time to educational work, even though he is supplementing his scholarship with funds derived from his own work. The section requires scholarship holders to maintain satisfactory proficiency in their course of study, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution. Students may not receive scholarship payments under this title concurrently with scholarship or fellowship aid or educational assistance from other Federal sources (other than a monetary allowance under a Reserve officers' training program or money paid under other provisions of this act).

Section 204—Selection of recipients of scholarships

The scholarship commission in each State will be the agency to decide the persons to whom scholarships under this title will be awarded, and the additional amount, if any to be paid them, based on the considerations referred to in the discussion of section 202. The selection will be in accordance with objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability to pursue successfully at an institution of higher education a course of study leading to a bachelor's degree, giving special consideration to those with superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern foreign language. It should be noted in this connection that once a person has been awarded a national defense scholarship no restrictions are imposed on the course he may choose to pursue. Similarly, he may choose to attend any school which will accept him so long as it qualifies as an institution of higher education under the definition in section 103 (b).

Any person will be eligible to compete for a national defense scholarship who applies in his State of residence in accordance with the rules of the State commission and is not, and has never been, enrolled in a course of study beyond the secondary school level.

The national defense scholarships will be actually awarded by the Commissioner, to persons selected by the State commissions who have been accepted for enrollment by an institution of higher education and have graduated from high school. The requirement of high school graduation will be met if the person holds a certificate of graduation from any high school whose graduates meet the requirements established by the State in which such school is located for graduation from high schools accredited by such State, or, if he doesn't hold such a certificate, if he is determined by the State commission to have attained a level of advancement generally accepted as constituting the equivalent of that required for graduation from such a high school.

Section 205—Allotment of appropriations for scholarships

When an appropriation is made for awarding new national defense scholarships, the Commissioner will first reserve up to 2 percent thereof for allotment to the Territories and possessions entitled thereto. He will then allot the remainder among the States on the basis of their relative populations between the ages of 18 and 21, both inclusive. The amount reserved for the Territories and possessions will be allotted among them in the manner provided for in section 908 of the bill.

Appropriations for making payments for scholarships awarded in prior years will be allotted among the States (including the Territories and possessions) on the basis of the relative amounts estimated to be needed to make continuing payments to persons selected for scholarships in prior years.

Section 206—State scholarship commissions; State plans

Each State which decides to participate in the scholarship program will establish a State commission on scholarships or may designate an existing State agency as the State commission on scholarships. Each such State will submit to the Commissioner a State plan which, if approved, will entitle it to participate in the scholarship program provided for in this title. The Commissioner will be required to approve a State plan if it contains the following:

(1) Provisions for determining the institutions in the State which are institutions of higher education, as defined in the bill.

(2) Provisions for the determination, in accordance with section 204 of the bill, of eligibility to compete for scholarships and for the selection and certification to the Commissioner of persons to be awarded the scholarships payable from the State's allotment.

(3) Provisions for annually determining, and certifying to the Commissioner the additional amounts (above the \$500 minimum per year) to be awarded persons in need thereof in accordance with standards, procedures, and criteria established by the State commission. The Commissioner must find that these standards, procedures, and criteria are such as to provide reasonable assurance that the additional amount will be based on the individual's need for financial assistance to continue his education at an institution of higher education, such need to be determined without regard to tuition, fees, and other expenses of attendance at the institution of higher education chosen by the individual, and that the maximum additional amount allowable under the plan will be \$500. This last requirement is inserted to insure that the State commissions, in granting additional amounts, will not adopt a policy of making only minimum grants. Instead, the State commissions will be required to spread the additional amounts between \$500 and zero.

(4) Provisions that the State commission will be the sole agency for administering the State plan.

(5) Provisions for reports to the Commissioner and for the fiscal control and fund accounting procedures which will be observed by the State commission.

Section 207—Administrative expenses of State commissions

This section provides for the payment by the Commissioner to the State of the amounts necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan and for expenses necessary for the preparation of an approved plan. These funds may be used by the State commissions to contract for the services of public or private merit or aptitude testing organizations.

TITLE III—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Section 301—Appropriations authorized

The purpose of this title is to enable the Commissioner to stimulate and assist institutions of higher education to establish funds for the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in such institutions. To achieve such purpose, this section authorizes the appropriation of \$40 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and \$60 million for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years. There are also authorized to be appropriated during the 4-year phase-out period of the program after fiscal 1962, such sums as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to the beginning of the phase-out period to continue or complete their education. The sums appropriated under this section may be used only for making the Federal capital contributions which, together with contributions from the institutions, will be used for establishing and maintaining student loan funds.

Section 302—Allotments to States

The sums appropriated under this title for fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1962, will be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative numbers of persons in the several States who are enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in the State. During the phase-out period after fiscal 1962, funds appropriated under this title will be allotted among the States as determined by the Commissioner to be necessary for the purpose of enabling students who have received loans for any school year ending prior to June 30, 1962, to continue or complete their education.

Section 303—Payment of Federal capital contributions

Federal capital contributions will be made to institutions of higher education applying therefor from time to time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan fund. Since the number of institutions which will wish to participate in this program may change from time to time, and the number of such institutions and the extent of their participation cannot be known in advance, it is not feasible to divide the State's allotment among institutions on a formula basis. Instead the bill provides that the Commissioner will set a date by which institutions wishing to participate in the program must apply and state the amount of Federal capital contribution they wish to be granted for their student loan funds. If, when such date is reached, the State's allotment is sufficient, the institutions which have made an agreement under this title with the Commissioner and meet the requirements established by him, will be paid the full amount requested. If, on such date, the amount requested by all such institutions in the State is larger than the State's allotment, then each institution's Federal capital contribution will be reduced pro rata below the amount it requested. Where the amount requested by institutions in a State is less than the State's allotment available for that purpose, the remainder may be reallocated among the other States from time to time in proportion to the original allotments to the States.

In order to assure that no one institution will receive an unduly large amount, it is provided that the Federal capital contributions to any one institution during a fiscal year may not exceed \$250,000.

Section 304—Conditions of agreements

No Federal capital contribution may be made under this title to an educational institution until it has entered into an agreement with the Commissioner to establish a student loan fund and to deposit in it (1) the Federal capital contribution, (2) an amount, not less than 25 percent of the Federal capital contribution, to be contributed by the institution, (3) all collections of principal and interest on student loans made from the fund, and (4) any other earnings of the fund. The agreement must also provide that the fund will be used only for making loans to students, except that it may also be used to meet the costs of litigation arising in connection with the collection of amounts due on account of the loan and except that distributions may be made from the fund as provided in section 306. The agreement must also contain such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of the title.

Section 305—Terms of loans

Subsection (a) provides that the maximum amount which may be loaned in one fiscal year to one student may not exceed \$1,000, and that the maximum amount which may be loaned one student for all years may not exceed \$5,000.

Under subsection (b), loans from student loan funds will be made on such terms and conditions as the institution may determine and subject to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner by regulation or in the agreement referred to above may prescribe with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling students to complete their courses of study. However, each loan made from a student loan fund must meet the requirements listed hereunder:

(1) A loan may be made only to a person who is a full-time student in good standing or, if not yet enrolled in an institution of higher education, has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student. Loans may be made only to students who are in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at the institution and are capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in the course of study. Graduate as well as undergraduate students will be eligible for loans under the title.

(2) The loan must be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides that the loan will be repaid in equal annual installments beginning one year after the borrower ceases to be a full-time student at the institution which made him the loan or another institution participating in the loan program or which is approved for this purpose by the Commissioner. The 10-year period could be extended for good cause determined under the Commissioner's regulations.

(3) The loan must bear interest (payable annually) at the rate of 2 percent per year on the unpaid principal balance during the period preceding the 10-year period during which the loan must be repaid. Thereafter, the loan will bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per year. The borrower may accelerate repayment of the loan without incurring a penalty and without advancing the time when interest at the rate of 4 percent per year would otherwise become payable.

(4) The loan must be made without security or endorsement, except in cases in which the borrower is a minor and under applicable law the note or other evidence of obligation would not create a binding obligation.

(5) All liability to repay the loan will be canceled if the borrower dies or becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner.

(6) The loan will be made in such installments as may be provided in the regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with the institution. Upon notice to the Commissioner by the institution that the borrower is not maintaining satisfactory standing any or all further installments of the loan will be withheld, as may be appropriate.

(7) The note or other evidence of obligation of the loan may not be assigned or transferred by the institution except if the borrower transfers to another institution it may be assigned or transferred to that institution if it is one which is participating in the program or is approved by the Commissioner for this purpose.

Subsection (c) of this section provides that the agreement for the payment of Federal capital contributions to an institution of higher education must include provisions designed to make loans from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement reasonably available (to the extent of the available funds in the student loan fund) to all eligible students in the institution in need thereof.

Section 306—Distributions of assets from student loan funds

This section provides for the time and manner of distributing the moneys in the student loan fund. Under its provisions, within 3 months after the end of the period during which loans may be made under the title, the money in the fund at the end of such period will be distributed between the Commissioner and the institution in the same ratio as the ratio between the Federal capital contributions to the fund and the institution's capital contributions. Thereafter, quarterly disbursements will be made from the money then accumulated (reduced by the amount of unpaid costs of litigation incurred in collecting the money) in the fund from repayments in the same shares as in the first distribution.

In addition to the distributions referred to above, upon a finding by the institution or the Secretary that the assets of a student loan fund exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the foreseeable future, a distribution will be made from the fund to the institution and to the Commissioner in the same proportionate shares as is provided for the first distribution referred to in the preceding paragraph.

Section 307—Loans to institutions

Under this section the Commissioner is authorized to make loans to institutions of higher education which are participating in a program under this title for the purpose of helping to finance the institution's capital contribution to its student loan fund. These loans may be made only if the institution shows that it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this title. Loans which are made under this title will bear interest at a rate equal to one-fourth of 1 percent above the rate payable by the Commissioner to the Treasury when he borrows the money necessary to make the loans.

The loan program provided for in this section will be financed in a manner similar to other Federal loan programs. The Treasury will purchase the obligations of the Commissioner under the Second Liberty Bond Act. The Commissioner's obligations will bear interest at a rate sufficient to cover the cost of the funds to the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this section. Sums repaid by institutions will be used to make payments on obligations issued by the Commissioner under the section, but in the event such repayments are insufficient, appropriations are authorized for payments on such obligations.

Loans made by the Commissioner under the section will mature within such period as he determines to be appropriate in each case, but not exceeding 15 years from the time the loan is made.

Section 308—Administrative provisions

In carrying out his duties under the title, the Commissioner may agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under the title, and compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand arising or acquired under the title, with the exception that nothing in the above will affect the power of the Attorney General in the conduct of litigation arising under the title. Financial transactions of the Commissioner under the title and vouchers approved by him in connection with such financial transactions, will be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government, except that all such transactions will be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office.

TITLE IV—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN-LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Section 401—Appropriations authorized

This title provides for grants to States for the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audiovisual materials and equipment and printed material (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages, and for minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such materials or equipment. Appropriations in the amount of \$60,000,000 are authorized for this purpose for each of the next 3 fiscal years.

In addition to appropriations for the purposes referred to above, the title authorizes the appropriation of \$5 million for each of such fiscal years for making grants to States solely for the expansion or improvement of supervisory and related services in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and for administration of the State plan.

Section 402—Allotments to States

Sums appropriated for laboratory and other special equipment and for remodeling will be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative school-age populations of the States, weighted by their relative incomes per school-age child. For example, if the income per school-age child in State A is 10 percent higher than the income per school-age child in State B, then the State A's allotment per school-age child will be 10 percent lower than that of State B. However, the weight which may be given income per school-age child is so limited as to insure that no State will receive more than twice as much per school-age child as the State receiving the smallest amount per school-age child. The children who will be counted for this purpose are those between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive. These allotments will remain available for payments until the end of the fiscal year following the year in which they are appropriated.

Sums appropriated for supervisory and related services and for administration will be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative school-age populations, unaffected by their income per school-age child. However, no State's allotment will be less than \$20,000, and the other States' allotments will be reduced to make up such minimum amount should it become necessary to raise a State's allotment to such minimum amount.

Before any other allotment is made under this section, the Commissioner will allot up to 2 percent of the appropriations available among the Territories and possessions as provided in section 908.

Section 403—State plans

If a State wishes to participate in this program it will submit a State plan to the Commissioner; if the plan contains the provisions required by this section, the Commissioner has no option but to approve it.

The provisions a State plan must contain to be approved are the following:

(1) It must set forth a program under which funds allotted to the State on the basis of relative school-age populations and incomes per school-age child will be expended solely for projects approved by the State educational agency for acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audio-visual materials and equipment and printed materials (other than text books), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language, for use in elementary or secondary schools, or both; and for minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such materials or equipment. It should be explained that while the State plan may provide only for the acquisition of this equipment for use in elementary or secondary schools, or both, there is nothing which prohibits its use for providing education above the secondary level or for other purposes once it is acquired in conformity with the State plan.

(2) It must set forth principles for determining the priority of each such project for assistance under the title and must provide for undertaking projects, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles.

(3) It must provide an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency to interested persons with respect to each application for the approval of a project.

(4) It must provide for the establishment of standards on a State level for laboratory and other special equipment acquired with assistance furnished under the title.

(5) It must set forth a program under which the funds allotted on the basis of school-age population unaffected by income per child of school age will be expended solely for the expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and for the administration of the State plan.

(6) It must provide that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering the plan.

(7) As in the case of the plans provided for in other titles, it must provide for reports to the Commissioner and for the observance of certain fiscal control and fund accounting procedures by the State educational agency.

Section 404—Payments to States

For the first year of the program no matching will be required with respect to grants for expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services or administration of the plan. The State will be required to match on a 50-50 basis all other grants of the Federal Government under this program.

TITLE V—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Section 501—Language institutes

The Commissioner will be authorized to enter into contracts with institutions of higher education under the terms of which they will operate short-term or regular session institutes during this and the next 3 fiscal years. These institutes will provide advanced training for persons who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign language in schools at the elementary or secondary level or in institutions of higher education. Emphasis will be given to training in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials.

Contracts under the section may cover all or part of the cost of an institute, and may contain such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purpose of the section.

In addition to making payments under contracts with an institution, the Commissioner may during the life of the program pay stipends to persons attending the institutes, and such stipends may include allowances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of residence by such persons and their dependents.

Section 502—Language and area centers

The Commissioner may arrange, through contracts, for the establishment and operation during this and the next 3 fiscal years of language centers for the teaching of any modern foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner determines that persons trained in such language are needed by the Federal Government or by business, industry, or education in the United States, and that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States.

The contract for the operation of a language center will provide principally for the teaching of such language, but it may also provide for instruction in other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which the language is commonly spoken, to the extent adequate instruction in such fields is not readily available, including such fields as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology.

Contracts with institutions under this section may not cover more than half the cost of the establishment and operation of the center, including the cost of grants to the staff for travel in the foreign area with which the subject matter of the field in which they will be working is concerned and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to such centers to teach or assist in teaching therein and the cost of their return. The contract may contain such other conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

The Commissioner may also, during this and the next 3 fiscal years, pay stipends to persons undergoing advanced training in any modern foreign language with respect to which he would be authorized to establish a center, and in other fields needed for a full understanding of the area, region, or country in which such language is commonly used. Such training will be provided at a short-term or regular session of an institution of higher education. The stipend may include allowances for dependents and for travel to and from the places of residence of the trainees and their dependents. However, a stipend under this section may be paid only to persons who provide reasonable

assurances that they will, on completion of their training, be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an institution of higher education or for such other service of a public nature as may be permitted by regulations of the Commissioner.

Section 503—Research and studies

This section authorizes the Commissioner to make, or contract for, studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages and other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such languages are commonly used. He is also authorized to conduct research on more effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in such training, or in training teachers of such languages or in such fields.

Section 504—Appropriations authorized

For carrying out this title, the bill authorizes the appropriation of up to \$4,500,000 a fiscal year.

TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

Section 601—Appropriations authorized

This section authorizes the appropriation of the sums necessary to carry out the title.

Section 602—Number of fellowships

Under this title the Commissioner will award fellowships for periods of study not in excess of 3 academic years. Not more than 1,000 fellowships will be awarded during this fiscal year, and not more than 1,500 fellowships will be awarded during each of the next 3 fiscal years.

Section 603—Award of fellowships and approval of institutions

The Commissioner will award fellowships only for study in graduate programs which have been approved by him. He will approve a graduate program for the purposes of this title if the institution applies for approval and he finds that the graduate program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded, that the new or expanded program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation, and that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs preference will be given to persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education.

The section also requires the Commissioner to limit the number of persons awarded fellowships in any one institution in light of the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation.

Section 604—Fellowship stipends

Each person who is awarded a fellowship under this title will be paid a stipend of \$2,000 for his first academic year of study after receipt of his bachelor's degree, \$2,200 for his second academic year of study after receipt of his bachelor's degree, and \$2,400 for his third academic

year of study after receipt of his bachelor's degree, plus an additional amount of \$400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

The institution which the fellowship holder is attending will also receive a payment under this program. The institution will be paid such amount, not less than \$500 or more than \$2,500 per academic year, as is determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the new or expanded graduate program in which the fellowship holder is participating which is reasonably attributable to such person.

Section 605—Fellowship conditions

Fellowship holders will receive their stipends only while they are maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and are devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship is awarded, in an institution of higher education, and are not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities.

TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

Section 701—Appropriations authorized

The purpose of this part is to assist State educational agencies in establishing and maintaining programs of testing and of guidance and counseling. For this purpose \$15 million a year is authorized to be appropriated for this and each of the next 3 fiscal years.

Section 702—Allotments to States

Appropriations for carrying out this part will be allotted among the States as follows: First, the Commissioner will reserve up to 2 percent of the appropriation for any fiscal year for allotment among the Territories and possessions as provided in section 908. He will then allot the remainder among the States on the basis of their relative school-age populations, except that the minimum allotment for any State will be \$20,000, and the other States' allotments will be reduced to make up such minimum amount should it become necessary to raise a State's allotment to such minimum amount.

Section 703—State plans

If a State wishes to participate in the program provided for in this part, it will submit a State plan to the Commissioner through its State educational agency. The Commissioner is required to approve the plan if it contains the provisions required by this section. The provisions which must be included in the State plan are the following:

(1) The plan must set forth a program under which funds paid to the State will be expended by the State educational agency, or by local educational agencies, to establish or maintain programs of testing and guidance and counseling which will operate in the secondary schools of the State. These programs must be directed at identifying students with outstanding aptitude or ability, advising students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and encouraging students with outstanding aptitude and ability to complete their secondary-school education, take the necessary course for

admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions after graduation. The plan must also set forth a description of the means of testing which will be used in carrying out the above programs.

(2) It must set forth the purposes for which, and the conditions under which, funds paid to the State will be granted to local educational agencies.

(3) It must provide for its administration by the State educational agency alone.

(4) It must contain provisions for reports to the Commissioner and for the observance of certain fiscal control and fund accounting procedures by the State educational agency.

Section 704—Payments to States

The Federal payment under this part will be 100 percent of the expenditures in carrying out the State plan during the first year of the program, and thereafter will be 50 percent of such expenditures. Of course, no State will receive amounts greater than its allotment. Funds paid a State under this title may be used to contract for the services of public or private merit or aptitude testing organizations.

PART B—INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

Section 721—Appropriations authorized

Six million dollars is authorized to be appropriated during this and each of the next 3 fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of this part.

Section 722—Purpose

The Commissioner will be required to arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher education, for the establishment and operation by them of summer or regular session institutes consisting of courses in counseling and guidance of students at the secondary school level with emphasis upon the counseling and guidance of gifted students. He will also be required to pay stipends to persons who attend the institutes and are eligible therefor.

Section 723—Contract authority

Contracts with institutions for establishing and operating institutes will provide for the payment of the reasonable cost incurred by the institution in providing the institute.

Section 724—Stipends

Students who attend an institute under this part will be eligible to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 a week, plus an additional amount of \$15 a week for each of his dependents, but no such person will receive a stipend at a rate in excess of his last rate of salary during the immediately preceding academic year. Stipends will be paid only for periods during which the recipient is in attendance in good standing at the institute, as determined by the Commissioner, in accordance with its regularly prescribed standards and practices.

Any person in a public-school system who is employed or is to be employed in a guidance and counseling capacity on a full-time or part-time basis will be eligible for the stipend.

It is expected that the Commissioner will endeavor to attain the maximum geographical distribution among institutions with which he contracts under this part, consistent with its purposes.

TITLE VIII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Section 801—Appropriations authorized; functions of Commissioner

This title will authorize the Commissioner, by grant or contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication by State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education in providing education. He may conduct research, demonstrations, and experiments for such purposes and in the development and use of new media of communication (and other audiovisual aids) for such purposes. He may evaluate and publish reports concerning the effectiveness of such media for such purposes, and prepare and publish abstracts and catalogs of audiovisual materials available for such purposes to the extent such abstracts or catalogs are not otherwise readily available. The title will also authorize the Commissioner to provide, upon request, advice, counsel, and technical assistance to State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize such media of communication in providing education.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 901—Administration

Under subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner will be authorized, in administering the provisions of the act, to use the services and facilities of other agencies of the Federal Government and of other public or nonprofit agencies or institutions, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head of the agency or institution. The provisions of law which require competitive bidding on Government contracts would not be applicable to these agreements.

Subsection (b) requires the Commissioner to include in his annual report a full report of activities under this act, together with such revisions in it as he may deem to be needed.

Subsection (c) requires the Secretary to advise and consult with the heads of other governmental agencies which carry on educational programs with a view to the full coordination of all specialized scholarship, fellowship, and other educational programs carried on by the Federal Government or with its assistance.

Section 902—Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies

The purpose of this section is to assist the States to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of educational statistics provided by State and local reports and records and the methods and techniques for collecting and processing educational data and disseminating information about the condition and progress of education in the States. Appropriations are authorized to carry out the section for this and each of the next 3 fiscal years.

The Federal Government will bear one-half the cost of programs to carry out the purpose of this section. The programs may include the following:

(1) Improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of statistical data supplied by local educational units.

(2) The development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve as guides for local educational units.

(3) The conduct of conferences and training for personnel of local educational units and of periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for records and reports.

(4) Improving methods for obtaining, from other State agencies within the State, educational data not collected by the State educational agency.

(5) Expediting the processing and reporting of statistical data through installation and operation of mechanical equipment.

Payments under the program provided for in this section may be made only to the extent it is a new program or an addition to or expansion of an existing program, and only if the State plan includes the program. No payment will be made to any State for a fiscal year under this section in an amount greater than \$50,000.

To obtain payments under this section, a State must submit a State plan which provides that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for carrying out programs under the plan either directly or through arrangements with other agencies of the State. It must also set forth the program proposed to be carried out and the general policies to be followed. In common with other provisions relating to State plans, this section requires the inclusion of provisions for reports to the Commissioner and for the observance of certain fiscal control and fund accounting procedures.

Section 903—Disapproval of, and failure to comply with, State plans

This section applies with respect to all State plans provided for in the bill. It insures that no such State plan or modification thereof will be disapproved without affording the interested State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

In the event the Commissioner determines, after the usual notice and opportunity for hearing, that a State plan has been so changed that it fails to meet the requirements of the act, or that the State agency concerned is failing to comply substantially with all its provisions, the Commissioner will suspend the State plan until he is satisfied that there is no longer any failure to comply.

While a State plan submitted under title II (relating to scholarships) is suspended no new scholarships will be awarded, or the Commissioner, in his discretion, may provide that the State Commission will not be eligible to participate in the part of the program under the title, or in the part of the State plan, which is affected by the failure to comply. While any other State plan is suspended, no further payments will be made thereunder for programs in that State.

Section 904—Judicial review

Under this section a State could obtain judicial review of action of the Commissioner in failing to approve a State plan or in suspending a State plan. The review would be on the record in the United States district court for the district in which the capital of the State is located. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act would

apply to these proceedings. The decision of the district court could be appealed to higher courts in the same fashion as other decisions of district courts of the United States.

Section 905—Method of payment

Payments under the various titles of this act, whether pursuant to a grant or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Section 906—Administrative appropriations authorized

This section authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the administration of the various provisions of the act.

Section 907—Acceptance of gifts and bequests

This section authorizes the Commissioner to accept gifts, grants, bequests, or devises for carrying out the act.

Section 908—Allotments to Territories and possessions

As stated herein with respect to section 205, section 402, and section 702, when the Commissioner allots funds among the States under those sections, he will reserve up to 2 percent for allotment under this section. The funds so reserved will be allotted among Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for the type of assistance furnished under the part or title in which the section appears.

Section 909—Advisory committees

This section authorizes the Commissioner to establish advisory committees to advise and consult with him with respect to the administration of the provisions of the bill relating to language development, expansion of graduate education, and research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion picture, and related media for educational purposes. Members of the advisory committees will be exempted from the conflicts of interest statutes, except that the exemption will not extend to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with his Government service from a source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment or during the period of such appointment, and the further period of 2 years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by him of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which he had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

MINORITY VIEWS

We, the undersigned minority of the committee, are opposed to the passage of H. R. 13247, as reported, for the following reasons:

The proposed bill starts with the declaration—

The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources of its young men and women.

With this statement, of course, we emphatically agree. We also believe that the mental resources of many of our young people are being inadequately developed by inadequate use of funds at hand.

This is due not to a lack of money as the majority of the committee assumes. It is due to an appalling decline of educational standards in many of our public schools and colleges, and to a debasement of the curriculum. There is also a diversion of the available human and material resources from courses that provide training in basic skills and transmit essential knowledge, to a hodgepodge of subject matter of education which has always remained out of private and parochial schools. It was so of the public schools until very recently.

The majority mistakenly assumes that—

(a) A large segment of our intellectually able young people who desire to go to college are prevented from doing so by a lack of means; and

(b) That the public schools are prevented from providing instruction in science, mathematics, and foreign languages or from identifying and advancing able young people, by a lack of funds.

Both of these assumptions are erroneous.

We find ample evidence that able young people who wish to go to college find ways and go to college. Further, that the public schools have the funds to provide better science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction, but that some prefer to use their staffs, facilities, and money to run courses which are unrelated to the educational purposes of the schools, such as date behavior, beauty care, consumer buying, stagecraft, square dancing, pep club, marriage and family relationships, junior homemaking for boys, etc.

It is apparent that the purposes of this bill can be better accomplished without Federal aid by the local schools and communities, and by the students who have the ability and desire to acquire a college education. The philosophy of this bill, like so many others, apparently seems to have altered a famous and good saying: "God helps those who help themselves" by adding: "The Government helps all others."

Thus, the apparent conclusion of the majority of the committee that Federal scholarships are needed, and will succeed in inducing more of our ablest youth to attend college is not substantiated by the evidence presented to the committee.

Instead, the most obvious consequence of such a Federal scholarship program would, we believe, be that voiced by many witnesses;

namely, "the discouragement of State and private programs," certainly, the lessening of local effort.

The evidence presented to the committee suggests a very different solution to our manpower problem. Repeatedly, witnesses reported that lack of motivation and inadequate preparation in fundamental subjects were the primary barriers to the full development of youth and to the continuance of their education beyond high school.

In proposing that the Federal Government provide in 1959-62 some 90,000 to 100,000 4-year undergraduate scholarships, the majority of the committee has erroneously assumed that—

(a) A shortage of professionally trained manpower exists in many fields which will be corrected by inducing more young people to go to college; and

(b) A large percentage of our most able young people do not attend college for financial reasons.

Evidence presented to the committee does not support these assumptions.

For example, the assumption that we have an overall shortage of scientists and engineers is widely accepted on the repetition of Government propaganda to that effect. And yet there is mounting evidence that this assumption is highly questionable.

Blank & Stigler reported in a study made for the National Bureau of Economic Research last year that the salaries of engineers and other professional workers have declined in comparison with the wages of other types of workers. They concluded:

Our example has been drawn so as to represent the general facts concerning engineers in the United States since 1890: demand has grown quite rapidly, but supply has grown even more rapidly so salaries have drifted downward relative to those for the entire working population.

The United States Office of Education recently announced that engineering enrollment in institutions of higher learning has increased from 165,637 in fall 1951 to 297,077 in fall 1957. This is an increase of 79 percent in 6 years.

Only 8 years ago in January 1950, the Engineers Joint Council expressed the feat the men due to graduate from engineering colleges in June of that year could not be effectively utilized by industry. The Korean war changed this picture. But even in a highly industrialized country, such as ours, there is a limit to the number of engineers that can be absorbed.

In a special report, *Engineers—Too Many or Too Few*, U. S. News & World Report pointed out that leaders of engineering societies, faculty members of engineering colleges, industrial leaders, and Government officials appeared to be in "General agreement on this: There is no real shortage of engineers overall. There may be shortages of some specific types of engineers."

The Assistant Secretary of Labor (now personnel adviser to the President) Rocco Siciliano emphasized that, while there are numerical shortages in some fields of engineering and science, the real need is for people at the top levels of knowledge, skill, and creativity.

The United States, like every other nation in the world, will probably never have enough brilliant scientists and engineers. But, with the amount of scholarship aid already available for the truly gifted stu-

dent, there is little reason to assume that a Federal scholarship program is needed—or would be successful in developing a reservoir of top-level talent.

It is equally incorrect for the committee to assume that those able young people who wish to attend college are not now doing so. John M. Stalnaker, president of the National Merit Scholarship Foundation, testified to the fact that:

In the National Merit Scholarship program last year we identified some 15,000 students. We have since then checked samples of these students to determine how many are not in college. Of the top 7,500 students, drawn from each State in proportion to population (just as both bills propose), we find about 97 percent are in college. Of the next 7,500, about 95 percent are in college.

Thus, without a Federal scholarship program, more of these students are going to college—well over 90 percent. Of those not going, only a fraction can be hoped to be changed by a Federal scholarship program. Many are girls. Some prefer marriage, some go into other types of training, and indeed, one cannot properly argue that they should not. Some of the boys have joined the armed services, others plan to attend college later. Still others are going into business.

I mention this study because we must not lose sight of the fact that neither of the bills proposes scholarship help to more than the top 3 percent of high-school students, and most of these students are eagerly sought by colleges and existing scholarship agencies. A large Federal program of, say, 40,000 scholarships would probably have as its major effect discouraging existing private and State efforts and would not significantly help able students not already being helped.

Evidence presented to the committee likewise showed the assumption invalid that financial need was preventing able young people from attending college. For example, Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, of the University of Chicago, on February 24, at the American Association of School Administrators meeting in St. Louis indicated that in the upper quartile of ability of last year's high-school graduates three-fourths of the males and three-fifths of the females were estimated to have entered college; that over one-half of the second quartile in ability and about one-tenth of the third quartile likewise sought admission.

Dr. Havighurst estimated that 60,000 boys out of the 285,000 in the upper quartile of male high-school graduates did not enter college. He further estimated that, of those 60,000, at least one-third had such poor habits, character, or background as to make them undesirable college students, and that the other 40,000 were largely boys that lacked motivation or interest in pursuing further education. It should be added here that there were certainly many among them who were either (1) drafted into the armed services, or (2) deeply interested in some trade or vocation, which not only required no college training, but offered as great or greater, and certainly more immediate, financial reward than those derived from positions requiring college training.

Still others unquestionably come from environments in which neither parents nor associates consider collegegoing to have prestige or vocation value.

Thus, while intelligence test scores or scholastic aptitude scores might indicate that most of these 60,000 boys could do college-grade work, they do not indicate that they have any desire to go to college or are interested in academic studies or a professional career.

Many recent studies have indicated that it is a lack of motivation and not financial inability that causes most of the discontinuance of education by high-ability youth.

Many university and college leaders have concurred in our belief that Federal scholarships are unnecessary and undesirable. The Association of American Colleges at its annual meeting rejected a resolution for Federal scholarships.

Subsequently, Dr. John Taylor Caldwell, representing the Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities Association, testified in opposition to Federal scholarships, recommending instead—as had the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School—a work-study project that would enable students to work and earn money while attending college.

Dr. V. Raymond Edman, president of Wheaton College, in an open letter to President Eisenhower said:

* * * we believe that Federal scholarships, good as they may seem on the outside, can be a real handicap to the highest interests of the American people.

FINANCIAL AID IS INCREASING

More than two-thirds of the States have some scholarship programs, and the number of scholarships financed by corporations, foundations, and individuals is growing rapidly.

Last year nearly 30 percent of the \$520 million dispensed by corporations for philanthropic purposes went to education. In 1952, only 20 percent of all gifts went into this area (Wall Street Journal, vol. CLI, No. 35).

Thousands of parents now meet college costs through a pay-as-you-go plan of monthly installments. This Tuition Plan, Inc., was started in 1938 and has grown rapidly in recent years. Its volume increased from \$8.7 million in 1955 to \$12 million in 1956; officials expect a volume of more than \$100 million in 1958.

The Massachusetts Legislature, in 1957, set up a Higher Education Assistance Corp. which guarantees 80 percent of long-term loans made by banks to qualified students for the purpose of paying their way through college. The capital is contributed by corporations and individuals. Up to the end of 1957, 109 banks had made 1,000 loans totaling almost half a million dollars, and it is planned to expand this to \$5 million in the future.

At least 800 schools offer long-term, low-interest loans. New York and North Dakota have set up plans similar to the one operating in Massachusetts; and Maine, Rhode Island, and Connecticut are also considering adoption of such a program.

Business firms are offering college loans for the children of their employees.

One difficulty encountered in the expanding loan program is that many available loan funds are inadequately used. President Ray Olpin, of the University of Utah, testified: "Most universities have some unused loan funds available."

Student aid in 1956

	Number	Amount
Undergraduate:		
Scholarships.....	237,370	\$65,736,950
Loans.....	77,107	12,463,182
Employment.....	288,479	65,931,915
Total.....	602,956	144,132,047
Graduate:		
Fellowships.....	24,885	18,239,150
Loans.....	30,507	4,986,742
Assistantships.....	29,406	35,007,789
Total.....	84,798	58,233,681

Titles IV, VII, and VIII provide grants to States for aid to public, elementary, and secondary schools for the instruction of science, mathematics, foreign languages, for guidance, counseling, and testing of students and for experimentation with and use of television, films, etc.

The proposals assume that the schools cannot finance these programs at the necessary level and that Federal funds are needed. Both of these assumptions are erroneous. The schools have ample funds available to provide more and better courses in the mentioned subjects, but often use them for purposes wholly unrelated to education.

The picture of understaffed, underhoused, and underfinanced schools which is frequently presented to the public is a mere fabrication of propagandists. A new study of the financing of public education, just released by the Institute for Social Science Research, Washington, D. C., under the title "School Needs in the Decade Ahead" demonstrates that lack of money is not responsible for short-comings of the schools. The findings of that study are summarized in the Congressional Record for July 10, 1958, page A6226.

The report, prepared by Roger A. Freeman, former Research Director of the United States Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and consultant on school finance to the White House Conference on Education, shows that school funds have increased at a more rapid rate than enrollment, national income, other governmental expenditures, or personal consumption. Wherever schools do provide inadequate staff, money, equipment, or facilities for instruction in science, mathematics, or foreign languages, they do so by their own choice because they allocate their resources to other subjects which are much less important and often out of place in a public-school curriculum.

Title IV would authorize grants totaling \$60 million annually for the acquisition of equipment suitable for education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages, and \$5 million annually for grants to State departments of education.

What evidence is there that the schools cannot afford to buy such equipment? Science equipment, for example, is not expensive. Dr.

Elbert Little, executive director of the physical science study committee, was recently quoted as saying:

There is no essential piece of equipment which a science teacher and his students can't build out of cheap materials. Apart from the initial outlay for the plant, the cost of laboratory equipment and supplies need run no higher than \$10 per student (Popular Science, November 1957).

The president of the American Association of School Administrators said this in addressing the 1956 convention of his group:

I have found that our science laboratories are very similar to what they were 25 years ago, but this is not true of vocational shops, cafeterias, and similar activities where we have the latest equipment. Even in some of the science laboratories of our new high schools, with all of the developments that we have had in recent years, I find the same equipment as a quarter of a century ago (Official Report of the 1956 AASA Convention, p. 144).

Actually, equipment for science, mathematics, and foreign-language instruction is far less expensive than for many of the modern activities programs for which schools often seem to be able to find money. Whether they decide to spend their funds on equipment for science instruction, or for co-ed cooking, depends on their sense of values, not on the amount of money available.

We do not believe that it is the business of the Federal Government to bribe schools into doing their job. But it is likely that when the bureaucrats in the United States Office of Education administer the funds, the money will be used to further life-adjustment education rather than the purpose for which the grants were authorized.

A major shortcoming in the fields of mathematics and science in the public schools is the inadequate preparation of teachers in these subject areas because of the stress that is being placed in teacher certification upon pedagogical methodology. There have been suggestions that teachers in subject fields which are short in supply, should be paid competitive salaries with industry, so that they can be attracted to the schools. When the educational magazine the Nation's Schools in June 1956 took a nationwide poll of school superintendents on this question, 84 percent replied that science teachers should not be paid more than other teachers.

Until it is recognized that the crux of the problem of science and mathematics instruction is better teachers—who can be obtained through a system of competitive pay based on merit—there is little hope of improving instruction in the schools. Also, as long as the schools offer and give credit for frill courses, and promote pupils regardless of accomplishment, the prospect that the children will study harder, is futile.

Title VII would authorize Federal funds for guidance, counseling, testing. Most public-school pupils are already being given standardized tests. Much of what the tests reveal can also be learned from the teachers' reports. Unfortunately, report cards have degenerated into speculating about the pupils' potential, instead of measuring his actual achievements. The problem here is not that able pupils cannot be identified, but that they cannot be motivated into studying

hard for the reasons mentioned above. As long as there are no rewards for effort and punishment for failure, we cannot expect pupils to exert themselves more.

Federal funds for more tests or counseling will do no good if schools do not even make adequate use of the ample information which is presently available.

Title VIII would authorize grants for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related mediums for educational purposes.

We are strongly in favor of more experimentation with and greater use of television, films, and other technological methods for the purpose of extending the use of good teachers and saving teachers' time.

The former superintendent of the Los Angeles schools, Alexander Stoddard, in a report, *Schools for Tomorrow*, prepared for the Fund for the Advancement of Education, estimated that 100,000 teaching positions could be saved by the use of instructional television.

However, the National Education Association has strongly objected to the use of technological methods for the purpose of saving teachers' time. They are afraid that this may reduce the number of job openings and weaken their ability to claim the existence of teacher shortages.

Until this resistance can be overcome, there is little hope that technological progress will accomplish much. Many schools could utilize television and movies more extensively now, based on the results of studies and experiments, but are prevented from doing so by the teachers' organizations. We can see little purpose served in providing Federal funds for school television unless there is a prospect that they will be used for making instruction more efficient.

**"FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, GET OUT OF EDUCATION," SAY
GOVERNORS**

Over 40 years ago the National Government began a temporary program of stimulating the States in a new field of education; namely, vocational training. The Joint Federal-State Action Committee of Governors and Federal Officials, appointed by President Eisenhower last fall, unanimously agreed that this function of education should be returned to the States. The administration has concurred in this viewpoint.

Is it not inconsistent then for the administration to propose to set up new grant-in-aid programs, similar to the vocational program, in the areas of guidance and science education, which most local and State school systems have long maintained? How is this contradiction justified? On the thesis that a national emergency has suddenly been discovered with which local and State governments cannot cope? This thesis is undocumented and, in our opinion, false (from testimony of K. Brantley Watson, vice president in charge of human relations, McCormick & Co., Baltimore, Md., p. 1540, hearings before a subcommittee of House Education and Labor Committee on H. R. 10381, H. R. 10278, and similar bills, March 21, 1958).

IN CONCLUSION

Does the Federal Government have a responsibility for handing a college education, for which many people work hard, to a few able youth? If there is such a responsibility, where can the line be drawn between those who receive the gift, and those to whom it is denied?

And most important, are there not other, and less dangerous, ways of supporting and improving our educational system? Can the number and amount of scholarships from State, local, and private sources be increased? Can greater work possibilities be made available through colleges to students from low-income families? Would a tax policy aimed at strengthening education by permitting deductions for tuition payments, and liberal provisions for corporate and individual donations for educational purposes be a better answer?

For over 150 years, the American people have been solving their educational problems at the State and local levels. There is no reason why they cannot continue to do so. The picture of strong centralized governments in some foreign countries is too alarming to justify changing our democratic pattern of local and State solutions to confronting education.

The detrimental effect of Federal grants has been pointed out time and again. Recently, Dr. George C. S. Benson, president of Claremont Men's College and former Research Director of the United States Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, stated in a book, *National Aid to Higher Education* (American Enterprise Association, Washington, D. C., 1958):

The evidence indicates that with grants go controls which contain dangers (1) to our type of government; (2) to our educational pattern.

This warning should be taken seriously when an extension of the activities of the Federal Government into the field of education is being proposed.

Respectfully submitted.

RALPH W. GWINN.
CLARE E. HOFFMAN.
DONALD W. NICHOLSON.

○

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

Union Calendar No. 887

H. R. 13247

[Report No. 2157]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 1, 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

JULY 15, 1958

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That this Act, divided into titles and sections according
4 to the following table of contents, may be cited as the
5 "National Defense Education Act of 1958".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 101. Findings and declaration of policy.
Sec. 102. Federal control of education prohibited.
Sec. 103. Definitions.

I—O

J. 20001—1

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

- Sec. 201. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 202. Amount of scholarships.
- Sec. 203. Duration of scholarships.
- Sec. 204. Selection of recipients of scholarships.
- Sec. 205. Allotment of appropriations for scholarships.
- Sec. 206. State scholarship commissions; State plans.
- Sec. 207. Administrative expenses of State commissions.

TITLE III—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

- Sec. 301. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 302. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 303. Payment of Federal capital contributions.
- Sec. 304. Conditions of agreements.
- Sec. 305. Terms of loans.
- Sec. 306. Distributions of assets from student loan funds.
- Sec. 307. Loans to institutions.
- Sec. 308. Administrative provisions.

TITLE IV—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

- Sec. 401. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 402. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 403. State plans.
- Sec. 404. Payments to States.

TITLE V—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

- Sec. 501. Language institutes.
- Sec. 502. Language and area centers.
- Sec. 503. Research and studies.
- Sec. 504. Appropriations authorized.

TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

- Sec. 601. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 602. Number of fellowships.
- Sec. 603. Award of fellowships and approval of institutions.
- Sec. 604. Fellowship stipends.
- Sec. 605. Fellowship conditions.

TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

- Sec. 701. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 702. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 703. State plans.
- Sec. 704. Payments to States.

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS—Continued

PART B—INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

Sec. 721. Appropriations authorized.

Sec. 722. Purpose.

Sec. 723. Contract authority.

Sec. 724. Stipends.

TITLE VIII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Sec. 801. Appropriations authorized; functions of Commissioner.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 901. Administration.

Sec. 902. Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

Sec. 903. Disapproval of, and failure to comply with, State plans.

Sec. 904. Judicial review.

Sec. 905. Method of payment.

Sec. 906. Administrative appropriations authorized.

Sec. 907. Acceptance of gifts and bequests.

Sec. 908. Allotments to Territories and possessions.

Sec. 909. Advisory committees.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. This requires programs that will demonstrate our country's recognition of and esteem for those of our students who have striven to develop their intellectual abilities to the fullest

1 extent, and will make available greater intellectual oppor-
2 tunities that are challenging to our youth.

3 The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that
4 the States and local communities have and must retain con-
5 trol over and primary responsibility for public education.
6 The national interest requires, however, that the Federal
7 Government give assistance to education for programs which
8 are important to our defense.

9 To meet the present educational emergency requires ad-
10 ditional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore
11 the purpose of this Act to provide substantial assistance in
12 various forms to individuals for study at institutions of higher
13 education, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to
14 insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity
15 to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

16 **FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED**

17 **SEC. 102.** Nothing contained in this Act shall be con-
18 strued to authorize any department, agency, officer, or em-
19 ployee of the United States to exercise any direction, super-
20 vision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction,
21 administration, or personnel of any educational institution
22 or school system.

23 **DEFINITIONS**

24 **SEC. 103.** As used in this Act—

25 (a) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii,

1 Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone,
2 Guam, or the Virgin Islands, except that as used in section
3 205 (a), 402, or 702, such term does not include Alaska,
4 Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin
5 Islands.

6 (b) The term "institution of higher education" means
7 an educational institution in any State which (1) admits
8 as regular students only persons having a certificate of grad-
9 uation from a school providing secondary education, or the
10 recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally
11 authorized within such State to provide a program of educa-
12 tion beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educa-
13 tional program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or
14 provides not less than a two-year program which is accept-
15 able for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or
16 other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a na-
17 tionally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if
18 not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted,
19 on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so
20 accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred
21 from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II,
22 such term includes an institution, not located in any State,
23 which the Commissioner determines to be substantially com-
24 parable to an institution which comes within the preceding
25 provisions of this subsection. For purposes of titles II

1 and III, such term includes any private business school or
2 technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses
3 (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For purposes of this sub-
4 section, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally
5 recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he
6 determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of train-
7 ing offered.

8 (c) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner
9 of Education.

10 (d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of
11 Health, Education, and Welfare.

12 (e) The term "State Commission" means a State
13 Commission on Scholarships established or designated in any
14 State to participate in a program under title II.

15 (f) The term "State educational agency" means the
16 State board of education or other agency or officer primarily
17 responsible for the State supervision of elementary and sec-
18 ondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an
19 officer or agency designated by the governor or by State
20 law.

21 (g) The term "school-age population" means that part
22 of the population which is between the ages of five and
23 seventeen, both inclusive, and such school-age population for
24 the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner
25 on the basis of the population between such ages for the

1 most recent year for which satisfactory data are available
2 from the Department of Commerce.

3 (h) The term "resident" when used with respect to any
4 State shall have the meaning established by regulations of
5 the Commissioner and shall include a citizen of the United
6 States who is domiciled in such State but is living outside
7 of any State.

8 (i) The term "elementary school" means a public
9 school which provides elementary education as determined
10 under State law.

11 (j) The term "secondary school" means a public school
12 which provides secondary education, as determined under
13 State law, except that it does not include any education
14 provided beyond grade 12.

15 (k) The term "local educational agency" means a
16 board of education or other legally constituted local school
17 authority having administrative control and direction of
18 elementary schools or secondary schools in a city, county,
19 township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

20 (l) The term "nonprofit", as applied to a school or
21 institution, means a school or institution owned and operated
22 by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no
23 part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully
24 inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

25 (m) The term "public" as applied to any school or

1 institution does not include a school or institution of any
2 agency of the United States.

3 TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

4 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

5 SEC. 201. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
6 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the
7 three succeeding fiscal years the sum of \$17,500,000 for
8 scholarships to persons who have not previously been
9 awarded scholarships under this title and who are selected
10 for award of such scholarships by the State Commissions.
11 In addition there are authorized to be appropriated for the
12 fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the six
13 succeeding fiscal years such sums as are estimated to be nec-
14 essary for making payments to individuals who have pre-
15 viously been awarded scholarships under this title. Scholar-
16 ships awarded under this title shall be known as "National
17 Defense Scholarships".

18 AMOUNT OF SCHOLARSHIPS

19 SEC. 202. Persons awarded scholarships under this
20 title shall be paid \$500 during each academic year of the
21 scholarships' duration as provided in section 203. Any
22 such person who is determined by the State Commission,
23 in accordance with the provisions of the State plan referred
24 to in section 206 (a) (3), to need additional financial
25 assistance to continue his education at an institution of

1 higher education, shall be paid an additional amount, not
2 to exceed \$500, during each such year based on his financial
3 need, such amount to be determined in accordance with
4 such provisions.

5 DURATION OF SCHOLARSHIPS

6 SEC. 203. The duration of a National Defense Scholar-
7 ship awarded under this title shall be a period of time not
8 in excess of four academic years, as defined in regulations
9 of the Commissioner, or, subject to regulations of the Com-
10 missioner, such longer period as is normally required to com-
11 plete the undergraduate curriculum which the recipient is
12 pursuing; but in no event shall the duration extend beyond
13 the completion by the recipient of the work for his first
14 bachelor's degree. Notwithstanding the preceding provi-
15 sions of this section, a scholarship awarded under this title
16 shall entitle the recipient to payments for such period only
17 if the Commissioner finds that he (1) devotes essentially
18 full time to educational work leading to a bachelor's degree,
19 during the academic year, in attendance at an institution of
20 higher education, (2) is maintaining satisfactory proficiency
21 in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the
22 regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution
23 which he is attending, and (3) is not receiving expenses
24 of tuition or other scholarship or fellowship aid or educational

1 assistance from other Federal sources (other than a monetary
2 allowance under a reserve officers' training program or
3 money paid under other provisions of this Act).

4 SELECTION OF RECIPIENTS OF SCHOLARSHIPS

5 SEC. 204. (a) An individual shall be eligible to compete
6 in any State for a National Defense Scholarship if he (1)
7 is a resident of the State; (2) makes application in accord-
8 ance with such rules as the State Commission for such State
9 may establish; and (3) is not, or has not been, enrolled in
10 any course of study beyond the secondary school level.

11 (b) From among those competing for National Defense
12 Scholarships for each fiscal year, each State Commission,
13 within the amount allotted to it for scholarships under sec-
14 tion 205 (a), shall select persons who are to be awarded
15 such scholarships during such year. Each State Commission
16 shall select persons to be awarded such scholarships in ac-
17 cordance with objective tests and other measures of apti-
18 tude and ability to pursue successfully at an institution of
19 higher education a course of study leading to a bachelor's
20 degree, giving special consideration to those with superior
21 capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern
22 foreign language.

23 (c) The Commissioner shall award a National Defense
24 Scholarship to each person with respect to whom he receives
25 a certification from a State Commission that such person—

(1) has been selected for a National Defense Scholarship under the provisions of this section,

(2) has been accepted for enrollment by an institution of higher education, and

(3) (A) holds a certificate of graduation, based on completion of the twelfth grade, from any high school whose graduates meet the requirements established by the State in which such school is located for graduation from high schools accredited by such State, or (B) in the case of an individual who does not hold such a certificate, is determined by such State Commission to have attained a level of advancement generally accepted as constituting the equivalent of that required for graduation from such a high school.

ALLOTMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SCHOLARSHIPS

SEC. 205. (a) From the sum appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to the first sentence of section 201 the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum of such sum, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 908. The remainder of such sum shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States as follows: Each State shall be allotted an amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate sum being allotted as its population between ages of 18 and 21, both inclusive, bears to the total population of all the States between such

1 ages. For the purposes of this section, populations between
2 such ages shall be determined on the basis of the popula-
3 tions between such ages for the most recent year, after
4 1955, for which satisfactory data are available from the
5 Department of Commerce.

6 (b) Sums appropriated under the second sentence of
7 section 201 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1959,
8 shall be allotted by the Commissioners among the States on
9 the basis of the relative amounts estimated to be needed to
10 make continuing payments for each such year to persons
11 selected by the State Commissions to be awarded National
12 Defense Scholarships in previous years.

13 **STATE SCHOLARSHIP COMMISSIONS; STATE PLANS**

14 SEC. 206. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the
15 scholarship program under this title may do so by establish-
16 ing a State Commission on Scholarships, or by designating
17 an existing agency of the State to serve as the State Commis-
18 sion on Scholarships, and by submitting to the Commissioner,
19 through such commission a State plan which—

20 (1) provides for the determination of the institu-
21 tions in the State which are institutions of higher
22 education as defined in section 103 (b) ;

23 (2) provides for the determination, in accordance
24 with the provisions of section 204, of eligibility to com-

1 pete for National Defense Scholarships, for the selection,
2 in accordance with such provisions, of persons to be
3 awarded such scholarships out of the State's allotment,
4 and for certification of such persons to the Commis-
5 sioner;

6 (3) provides (A) for the annual determination of
7 the additional amounts to be awarded persons in need
8 thereof under section 202 in accordance with standards,
9 procedures, and criteria established by the State Com-
10 mission, which the Commissioner finds provide reason-
11 able assurance (i) that the additional amount will be
12 based on the individual's need for financial assistance to
13 continue his education at an institution of higher educa-
14 tion, such need to be determined without regard to tui-
15 tion, fees, and other expenses of attendance at the institu-
16 tion of higher education chosen by the individual, and
17 (ii) that the maximum additional amount allowable
18 under the plan shall be \$500, and (B) for the annual
19 certification, of each such additional amount and the
20 person to whom it is to be paid, to the Commissioner;

21 (4) provides that the State Commission will be the
22 sole agency for administering the plan;

23 (5) provides that the State Commission will make
24 such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and con-

1 taining such information, as may be reasonably neces-
2 sary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties
3 under this title; and

4 (6) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
5 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure
6 proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal
7 funds paid to the State under this title.

8 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
9 which complies with the conditions specified in subsection
10 (a).

11 **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF STATE COMMISSIONS**

12 SEC. 207. The Commissioner shall pay to each State
13 such amounts as the Commissioner determines to be neces-
14 sary for the proper and efficient administration of the State
15 plan (including reimbursement to the State for expenses
16 which the Commissioner determines were necessary for the
17 preparation of the State plan approved under this title).

18 **TITLE III—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITU-**
19 **TIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

20 **APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED**

21 SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner
22 to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of
23 higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans
24 to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in

1 such institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropri-
2 ated \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
3 \$60,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years,
4 and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and
5 each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary
6 to enable students who have received a loan for any school
7 year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or complete
8 their education. Sums appropriated under this section for
9 any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agree-
10 ments between the Commissioner and institutions of higher
11 education, for payment of Federal capital contributions
12 which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall
13 be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan
14 funds.

15 ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

16 SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant
17 to section 301 for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1,
18 1962, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount
19 which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated
20 as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in
21 institutions of higher education in such State bears to the
22 total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in
23 institutions of higher education in all of the States. The
24 number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions

1 of higher education for purposes of this section shall be
2 determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year
3 for which satisfactory data are available to him.

4 (b) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any
5 fiscal year ending after June 30, 1962, shall be allotted
6 among the States in such manner as the Commissioner deter-
7 mines to be necessary to carry out the purpose for which
8 such amounts are appropriated,

9 PAYMENT OF FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

10 SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to
11 time set dates by which institutions of higher education in
12 a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions
13 from the allotment of such State. In the event the total re-
14 quested in such applications, which are made by institutions
15 with which he has agreements under this title and which
16 meet the requirements established in regulations of the Com-
17 missioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State
18 available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution
19 from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the
20 same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the
21 amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to
22 the total requested in all such applications. In the event
23 the total requested in such applications which are made by
24 institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allot-
25 ment of such State available for such purpose, the Commis-

1 sioner may realLOT the remaining amount from time to time,
2 on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other
3 States in proportion to the original allotments to such States
4 under section 302 for such year. The Federal capital con-
5 tribution to an institution shall be paid to it from time to
6 time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will
7 not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan
8 fund.

9 (b) In no case may the total of such Federal capital
10 contributions to any institution of higher education for any
11 fiscal year exceed \$250,000.

12 CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENTS

13 SEC. 304. An agreement with any institution of higher
14 education for Federal capital contributions by the Commis-
15 sioner under this title shall—

16 (1) provide for establishment of a student loan
17 fund by such institution;

18 (2) provide for deposit in such fund of (A) the
19 Federal capital contributions, (B) an amount, not less
20 than 25 per centum thereof, contributed by such institu-
21 tion, (C) collections of principal and interest on student
22 loans made from such fund, and (D) any other earnings
23 of the fund;

24 (3) provide that such student loan fund shall be

1 used only for loans to students in accordance with such
2 agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this
3 title, and for costs of litigation arising in connection
4 with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest
5 on such loan; and

6 (4) include such other provisions as may be neces-
7 sary to protect the financial interest of the United States
8 and promote the purposes of this title and as are agreed
9 to by the Commissioner and the institution.

10 TERMS OF LOANS

SEC. 305. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year to any student made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed \$1,000, and the total for all years to any student from such funds may not exceed \$5,000.

(b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by any institution of higher education shall be made on such terms and conditions as the institution may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the institution) with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of study; and except that—

(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study and has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate or graduate student;

(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount in equal annual installments over a ten-year period which begins one year after the borrower ceases to be a full-time student at the institution of higher education which made the loan or at any other institution which is participating in the program established under this title (or, if not participating, has been approved by the Commissioner for the purpose of this paragraph) : *Provided*, That such ten-year period may be extended for good cause determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

(3) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, at the rate of 2 per centum per annum during the period prior to the first year for which

1 repayment of an installment on the principal is due
2 (such interest to be paid annually during such period)
3 and at the rate of 4 per centum per annum after such
4 period: *Provided*, That the borrower may at his option
5 repay all or any part of the loan in advance of the time
6 or times when due, and such repayment shall be made
7 without penalty and without advancing the first year for
8 which interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum, in
9 lieu of 2 per centum per annum, would otherwise be
10 payable under this title;

11 (4) no security or endorsement may be required for
12 any such loan unless the borrower is a minor and the
13 note or other evidence of obligation executed by him
14 would not, under the applicable law, create a binding
15 obligation;

16 (5) the liability to repay any such loan shall be
17 canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he be-
18 comes permanently and totally disabled as determined
19 in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

20 (6) such a loan by an institution for any year shall
21 be made in such installments as may be provided in
22 regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with
23 the institution under this title and, upon notice to the
24 Commissioner by the institution that any recipient of
25 a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any

1 or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld,
2 as may be appropriate; and

3 (7) no note or other evidence of such a loan may
4 be transferred or assigned by the institution of higher
5 education making the loan except, upon the transfer of
6 the borrower to another institution of higher education
7 participating in the program under this title (or, if not
8 participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by
9 the Commissioner for such purpose), to such institution.

10 (c) An agreement under this title for payment of Fed-
11 eral capital contributions to any institution of higher educa-
12 tion shall include provisions designed to make loans from
13 the student loan fund established pursuant to such agree-
14 ment reasonably available (to the extent of the available
15 funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such institution
16 in need thereof.

17 DISTRIBUTIONS OF ASSETS FROM STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

18 SEC. 306. (a) After June 30, 1966, and not later than
19 September 30, 1966, there shall be a capital distribution of
20 the balance of the student loan fund established under this
21 title by each institution of higher education as follows:

22 (1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount
23 which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund
24 at the close of June 30, 1966, as the total amount of the
25 Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Com-

1 missioner under this title bears to the sum of such Fed-
2 eral capital contributions and the institution's capital con-
3 tributions to such fund.

4 (2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid
5 to the institution.

6 (b) After September 30, 1966, each institution with
7 which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this
8 title shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than
9 quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received
10 by the institution after June 30, 1966, in payment of prin-
11 cipal or interest on student loans made from the student
12 loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which
13 amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of
14 litigation incurred in collection thereof and not already re-
15 imbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of
16 principal or interest) as was paid to the Commissioner under
17 subsection (a).

18 (c) Upon a finding by the institution or the Commis-
19 sioner prior to July 1, 1966, that the liquid assets of a student
20 loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this
21 title exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the
22 foreseeable future, and upon notice to such institution and
23 to the Commissioner, there shall be, subject to such limita-
24 tions as may be included in regulations of the Commissioner

1 or in such agreement, a capital distribution from such fund.

2 Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

3 (1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount
4 which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed
5 as the Federal capital contributions by the Commis-
6 sioner to the student loan fund prior to such distribution
7 bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions
8 and the capital contributions to the fund made by the
9 institution.

10 (2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall
11 be paid to the institution.

12 LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS

13 SEC. 307. (a) Upon application by any institution of
14 higher education with which he has made an agreement
15 under this title, the Commissioner may make a loan to such
16 institution for the purpose of helping to finance the institu-
17 tion's capital contributions to a student loan fund established
18 pursuant to such agreement. Any such loan may be made
19 only if such institution shows it is unable to secure such funds
20 from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which
21 the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent
22 with the purposes of this title. Loans made to institutions
23 under this section shall bear interest at a rate equal to one-
24 fourth of 1 per centum above the rate payable by the Com-

1 missioner to the Treasury for funds borrowed to finance such
2 loans.

3 (b) (1) For the purpose of financing loans to institu-
4 tions under this section, the Commissioner shall issue notes,
5 debentures, or other obligations for purchase by the Secre-
6 tary of the Treasury. Obligations issued by the Commis-
7 sioner under this subsection shall be in such form and de-
8 nominations, and be subject to such terms and conditions,
9 as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval
10 of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such obligations shall bear
11 interest at a rate sufficient to cover the cost of the funds
12 to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the
13 Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields
14 of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States
15 having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans
16 made by the Commissioner under this section.

17 (2) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and
18 directed to purchase any obligations of the Commissioner
19 issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized
20 to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the
21 sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond
22 Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may
23 be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to in-

1 clude any purchases of the Commissioner's obligations here-
2 under. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such
3 sums as may be necessary, together with repayments made
4 by institutions hereunder, for payments on obligations issued
5 by the Commissioner under this section. Any such repay-
6 ments not required for such purpose shall be deposited in the
7 Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

8 (c) Loans made by the Commissioner under this section
9 shall mature within such period as may be determined by
10 the Commissioner to be appropriate in each case, but not
11 exceeding fifteen years.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

13 SEC. 308. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the
14 other powers conferred upon him by this title, shall have
15 power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made
16 under this title and to compromise, waive, or release
17 any right, title, claim, or demand, however arising or
18 acquired under this title, except that nothing in this sub-
19 section shall be construed to affect the power of the Attorney
20 General in the conduct of litigation arising under this Act.

21 (b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pur-
22 suant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in con-

1 nection with such financial transactions, shall be final and
2 conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that
3 all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General
4 Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the
5 Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

6 TITLE IV—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTH-
7 ENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MOD-
8 ERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN
9 PUBLIC SCHOOLS

10 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

11 SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
12 ated \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
13 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making
14 payments to State educational agencies under this title for
15 the acquisition of equipment (suitable for use in provid-
16 ing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign
17 language) and for minor remodeling which are referred to
18 in paragraph (1) of section 403 (a). There are hereby
19 authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year
20 ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding
21 fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agen-
22 cies under this title to carry out the programs referred to in
23 paragraph (5) of section 403 (a).

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 402. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 401 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 908. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

(A) the school-age population of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)),

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(2) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the continental United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum or more than $66\frac{2}{3}$ per centum. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and

1 August 31 of the year 1959, on the basis of the average
2 of the incomes per child of school age for the States and
3 for the continental United States for the three most recent
4 consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available
5 from the Department of Commerce. The first such promul-
6 gation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in
7 the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30,
8 1960, and the second shall be conclusive for each of the two
9 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending
10 June 30, 1962.

11 (3) For the purposes of this title—

12 (A) The term “child of school age” means a mem-
13 ber of the population between the ages of five and
14 seventeen, both inclusive.

15 (B) The term “continental United States” does not
16 include Alaska.

17 (C) The term “income per child of school age” for
18 any State or for the continental United States means the
19 total personal income for the State and the continental
20 United States, respectively, divided by the number of
21 children of school age in such State and in the conti-
22 nental United States, respectively.

23 (4) A State’s allotment under this subsection shall re-
24 main available for payment pursuant to section 404 (a) for

1 projects in such State until the end of the fiscal year following
2 the year for which the allotment is made.

3 (b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the sec-
4 ond sentence of section 401 for any fiscal year the Com-
5 missioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2
6 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as
7 provided in section 908. From the remainder of such sums
8 the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which
9 bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the
10 school-age population of such State bears to the total of the
11 school-age populations of all of the States. The amount
12 allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any
13 fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to
14 \$20,000, the total thereby required being derived by propor-
15 tionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remain-
16 ing States under the preceding sentence, but with such ad-
17 justments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of
18 any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced
19 to less than \$20,000.

20 STATE PLANS

21 SEC. 403. (a) Any State which desires to receive pay-
22 ments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner,
23 through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

1 (1) sets forth a program under which funds paid
2 to the State from its allotment under section 402 (a)
3 will be expended solely for projects approved by the
4 State educational agency for (A) acquisition of labora-
5 tory and other special equipment, including audio-visual
6 materials and equipment and printed materials (other
7 than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education
8 in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language,
9 for use in elementary or secondary schools, or both, and
10 (B) minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used
11 for such materials or equipment;

12 (2) sets forth principles for determining the prior-
13 ity of such projects in the State for assistance under
14 this title and provides for undertaking such projects,
15 insofar as financial resources available therefor make
16 possible, in the order determined by the application of
17 such principles;

18 (3) provides an opportunity for a hearing before the
19 State educational agency to interested persons with
20 respect to each application for the approval of such a
21 project under this title;

22 (4) provides for the establishment of standards on
23 a State level for laboratory and other special equipment
24 acquired with assistance furnished under this title;

25 (5) sets forth a program under which funds paid to

1 the State from its allotment under section 402 (b) will
2 be expended solely for (A) expansion or improvement
3 of supervisory or related services in the fields of
4 science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and
5 (B) administration of the State plan;

6 (6) provides that the State educational agency will
7 be the sole agency for administering the plan;

8 (7) provides that the State educational agency will
9 make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and
10 containing such information, as may be reasonably nec-
11 essary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties
12 under this title; and

13 (8) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
14 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure prop-
15 er disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid
16 to the State under this title.

17 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
18 and any modification thereof which complies with the pro-
19 visions of subsection (a).

20 PAYMENTS TO STATES

21 SEC. 404. (a) From a State's allotment for a fiscal year
22 under section 402 (a), the Commissioner shall, from time to
23 time during the period such allotment is available for pay-
24 ment as provided in paragraph (4) of section 402 (a), pay
25 to such State an amount equal to one-half of the expendi-

1 tures for projects for acquisition of equipment and minor re-
 2 modeling referred to in paragraph (1) of section 403 (a)
 3 which are carried out under its State plan approved under
 4 section 403 (b) ; except that no State shall receive payments
 5 under this subsection for any period in excess of its allotments
 6 for such period under section 402 (a) .

7 (b) From a State's allotment under section 402 (b) for
 8 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner shall
 9 from time to time pay to such State an amount equal to the
 10 amount expended by such State for such year to carry out
 11 the program referred to in paragraph (5) of section 403 (a)
 12 under its State plan approved under section 403 (b) . From
 13 a State's allotment under section 402 (b) for the fiscal year
 14 ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding
 15 fiscal years, such payment shall equal 50 per centum of the
 16 amount so expended under its State plan approved under
 17 section 403 (b) ; except that no State shall receive payments
 18 under this subsection for any fiscal year in excess of its allot-
 19 ment under section 402 (b) for that fiscal year.

20 TITLE V—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

21 LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

22 SEC. 501. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to
 23 arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher edu-
 24 cation, for the operation by them, during the period begin-
 25 ning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30,

1 1962, of short-term regular session institutes for advanced
2 training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods
3 and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged
4 in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising
5 or training teachers of any modern foreign language in
6 schools at the elementary or secondary level or in institu-
7 tions of higher education.

8 (b) A contract pursuant to this section may cover
9 all or any part of the cost of the institute with respect
10 to which it is made, and may be made on such conditions
11 as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the pur-
12 poses of this section.

13 (c) The Commissioner is also authorized during the pe-
14 riod beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of
15 June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals attending any
16 institute established under this section, including allowances
17 for dependents and for travel to and from their places of
18 residence.

19 LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS

20 SEC. 502. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to ar-
21 range through contracts with institutions of higher education
22 for the establishment and operation by them, during the
23 period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of
24 June 30, 1962, of centers for the teaching of any modern
25 foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner

1 determines (1) that individuals trained in such language are
2 needed by the Federal Government or by business, industry,
3 or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate
4 instruction in such language is not readily available in the
5 United States. Any such contract may provide for instruc-
6 tion not only in such modern foreign language but also in
7 other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the
8 areas, regions, or countries in which such language is com-
9 monly used, to the extent adequate instruction in such fields
10 is not readily available, including fields such as history, po-
11 litical science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography,
12 and anthropology. Any such contract may cover not more
13 than 50 per centum of the cost of the establishment and
14 operation of the center with respect to which it is made,
15 including the cost of grants to the staff for travel in the for-
16 eign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject mat-
17 ter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working
18 is concerned and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to such
19 centers to teach or assist in teaching therein and the cost of
20 their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the
21 Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of
22 this section.

23 (b) The Commissioner is also authorized, during the

1 period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close
2 of June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals undergoing
3 advanced training in any modern foreign language (with
4 respect to which he makes the determination under clause
5 (1) of subsection (a)), and other fields needed for a full
6 understanding of the area, region, or country in which such
7 language is commonly used, at any short-term or regular ses-
8 sion of any institution of higher education, including allow-
9 ances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of
10 residence, but only upon reasonable assurance that the re-
11 cipients of such stipends will, on completion of their training,
12 be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an
13 institution of higher education or for such other service
14 of a public nature as may be permitted in regulations of the
15 Commissioner.

16 RESEARCH AND STUDIES

17 SEC. 503. The Commissioner is authorized, directly or
18 by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the
19 need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign
20 languages and other fields needed to provide a full under-
21 standing of the areas, regions, or countries in which such
22 languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more
23 effective methods of teaching such languages and in such

1 other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in
2 such training, or in training teachers of such languages or
3 in such fields.

4 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

5 SEC. 504. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
6 priated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the
7 provisions of this title, not to exceed \$4,500,000 in any one
8 fiscal year.

9 TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE
10 EDUCATION

11 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

12 SEC. 601. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
13 ated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the pro-
14 visions of this title.

15 NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS

16 SEC. 602. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
17 the Commissioner is authorized to award one thousand fel-
18 lowships under the provisions of this title, and during each
19 of the three succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award
20 one thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellow-
21 ships shall be for periods of study not in excess of three aca-
22 demic years.

23 AWARD OF FELLOWSHIPS AND APPROVAL OF INSTITUTIONS

24 SEC. 603. (a) The Commissioner shall award fellow-
25 ships under this title to individuals accepted for study in

1 graduate programs approved by him under this section. The
2 Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an insti-
3 tution of higher education only upon application by the insti-
4 tution and only upon his finding that:

5 (1) such program is a new program or an existing
6 program which has been expanded,

7 (2) such new program or expansion of an existing
8 program will substantially further the objective of in-
9 creasing the facilities available in the Nation for the
10 graduate training of college or university level teachers
11 and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of
12 such facilities throughout the Nation, and

13 (3) in the acceptance of persons for study in such
14 programs preference will be given to persons interested
15 in teaching in institutions of higher education.

16 (b) The total of the fellowships awarded under this
17 title for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program
18 at any institution of higher education may not exceed
19 a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the
20 objective referred to in subsection (a) (2).

21 **FELLOWSHIP STIPENDS**

22 **SEC. 604.** (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under
23 the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of \$2,000
24 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate
25 degree, \$2,200 for the second such year, and \$2,400 for

1 the third such year, plus an additional amount of \$400 for
2 each such year on account of each of his dependents.

3 (b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant
4 to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of
5 higher education at which each such person is pursuing
6 his course of study such amount, not less than \$500 or more
7 than \$2,500 per academic year, as is determined by the
8 Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the
9 new graduate program or of the expansion in an existing
10 graduate program which he is pursuing, which is reasonably
11 attributable to such person.

12 FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

13 SEC. 605. A person awarded a fellowship under the
14 provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments
15 provided in section 604 (a) only during such periods as
16 the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory
17 proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study
18 or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded,
19 in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in
20 gainful employment other than part-time employment by
21 such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities
22 approved by the Commissioner.

1 TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING;
2 IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT
3 OF ABLE STUDENTS

4 PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

5 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

6 SEC. 701. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
7 ated \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
8 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making
9 grants to State educational agencies under this part to assist
10 them to establish and maintain programs of testing and
11 guidance and counseling.

12 ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

13 SEC. 702. From the sums appropriated pursuant to sec-
14 tion 701 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve
15 such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as
16 he may determine for allotment as provided in section 908.
17 From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall
18 allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to
19 the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of
20 such State bears to the total of school-age populations of all
21 of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the
22 preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than

1 \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total of increases
2 thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing
3 the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under
4 the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may
5 be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining
6 States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

7 STATE PLANS

8 SEC. 703. (a) Any State which desires to receive pay-
9 ments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner,
10 through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

11 (1) sets forth (A) a program under which funds
12 paid to the State under this part will be expended by
13 the State educational agency, or granted by it to local
14 educational agencies in the State for expenditure, to
15 establish or maintain programs of testing and guidance
16 and counseling which will operate in the secondary
17 schools of such State and be directed at (i) identifying
18 students with outstanding aptitude and ability in such
19 schools, (ii) advising students of courses of study best
20 suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (iii)
21 encouraging students with outstanding aptitude and
22 ability to complete their secondary school education,
23 take the necessary courses for admission to institutions
24 of higher education, and enter such institutions after

1 completion of their secondary school education; and

2 (B) the means of testing which will be utilized in carry-
3 ing out such programs;

4 (2) sets forth the purposes for, and the conditions
5 under, which funds paid to a State under this part will
6 be granted to local educational agencies in such State;

7 (3) provides that the State educational agency
8 will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

9 (4) provides that the State educational agency
10 will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such
11 form and containing such information as may be reason-
12 ably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform
13 his duties under this part; and

14 (5) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
15 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper
16 disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid
17 to the State under this part.

18 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
19 and any modification thereof which complies with the pro-
20 visions of subsection (a).

21 PAYMENTS TO STATES

22 SEC. 704. Payment under this part shall be made to
23 those State educational agencies which administer plans
24 approved under section 703. For the fiscal year ending

1 therefor to the Commissioner. For the fiscal year ending
2 June 30, 1959, such payments shall equal the amount ex-
3 pended by the State in carrying out its State plan, and for
4 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the
5 two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal 50
6 per centum of the amount so expended; except that no State
7 educational agency shall receive payment under this part
8 for any fiscal year in excess of that State's allotment for
9 that fiscal year as determined under section 702.

10 PART B—INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING
11 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

12 SEC. 721. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
13 priated \$6,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30,
14 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for
15 the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this part.

16 PURPOSE

17 SEC. 722. The Commissioner shall (1) arrange through
18 contracts with institutions of higher education for the estab-
19 lishment and operation by them of summer or regular session
20 institutes consisting of courses in the counseling and guidance
21 of students at the secondary school level with emphasis upon
22 the counseling and guidance of gifted students, and (2) pay
23 stipends under the provisions of this part to eligible persons
24 who attend such institutes.

CONTRACT AUTHORITY

SEC. 723. A contract with an institution of higher education under the provisions of this part shall provide for the payment to such institution of the reasonable cost incurred by it in providing the summer or regular session institute contracted for.

STIPENDS

SEC. 724. Any person employed in a public-school system who is employed or is to be employed in a guidance and counseling capacity on a full- or part-time basis and who enrolls in and attends a summer or regular session institute contracted for under this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute. Each such person with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance. However, no person shall receive a stipend under this title at a rate in excess of his last rate of salary for the immediately preceding academic year. Stipends under this section shall be paid only for periods during which the recipient is in attendance in good standing at the institute as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with its regularly prescribed standards and practices.

1 TITLE VIII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTA-
2 TION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF
3 TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND
4 RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PUR-
5 POSES

6 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED; FUNCTIONS OF
7 COMMISSIONER

8 SEC. 801. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
9 \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and
10 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the
11 Commissioner, through grants or contracts, to—

12 (1) make studies and surveys to determine the
13 need for increased or improved utilization of television,
14 radio, motion pictures, and related media of communica-
15 tion by State or local educational agencies and institu-
16 tions of higher education in providing education;

17 (2) conduct research, demonstrations, and experi-
18 ments in the use of such media for such purposes;

19 (3) conduct research, demonstrations, and experi-
20 ments in the development and use of new media of
21 communication (and other audio-visual aids) for such
22 purposes;

23 (4) evaluate and publish reports concerning the
24 effectiveness of such media for such purposes; and

25 (5) prepare and publish abstracts and catalogs of

1 audio-visual materials available for such purposes to the
2 extent such abstracts or catalogs are not otherwise
3 readily available; and

4 to enable him to provide, upon request, advice, counsel, and
5 technical assistance to State or local educational agencies
6 and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize
7 such media of communication in providing education.

8 TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

9 ADMINISTRATION

10 SEC. 901. (a) In administering this Act, the Com-
11 missioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities
12 of any agency of the Federal Government and, without
13 regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United
14 States (41 U. S. C., sec. 5), of any other public or non-
15 profit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements
16 between the Secretary and the head thereof.

17 (b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report
18 a full report of the activities under this Act, including
19 recommendations for needed revisions in its provisions.

20 (c) The Secretary shall advise and consult with the
21 heads of executive departments and independent establish-
22 ments of the Federal Government responsible for the admin-
23 istration of scholarship, fellowship, or other educational
24 programs, with a view to the full coordination of all
25 specialized scholarship, fellowship, and other educational

1 programs administered by or under all departments and
2 establishments of the Federal Government with the programs
3 established by this Act.

4 IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES OF STATE
5 EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

6 SEC. 902. (a) For the purpose of assisting the States
7 to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of
8 educational statistics provided by State and local reports and
9 records and the methods and techniques for collecting and
10 processing educational data and disseminating information
11 about the condition and progress of education in the States,
12 there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal
13 year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding
14 fiscal years, for grants to States under this section, such sums
15 as the Congress may determine.

16 (b) Grants under this section by the Commissioner shall
17 be equal to one-half of the cost of State educational agency
18 programs to carry out the purposes of this section, including
19 (1) improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of
20 statistical data supplied by local educational units, (2) the
21 development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve
22 as guides for local educational units, (3) the conduct of con-
23 ferences and training for personnel of local educational units
24 and of periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for
25 records and reports, (4) improving methods for obtaining,

1 from other State agencies within the State, educational data
2 not collected by the State educational agency, or (5) ex-
3 pediting the processing and reporting of statistical data
4 through installation and operation of mechanical equipment.
5 The total of the payments to any State under this section
6 for any fiscal year may not exceed \$50,000.

7 (c) Payments with respect to any program of a State
8 educational agency under this section may be made (1) only
9 to the extent it is a new program or an addition to or expan-
10 sion of an existing program, and (2) only if the State plan
11 approved under subsection (d) includes such program.

12 (d) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for
13 purposes of this section if such plan—

14 (1) provides that the State educational agency shall
15 be the sole agency for carrying out programs under
16 the plan either directly or through arrangements with
17 other agencies of the State;

18 (2) sets forth the program proposed to be carried
19 out under the plan and the general policies to be followed
20 in doing so;

21 (3) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
22 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure
23 proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds
24 paid to the State under this section; and

25 (4) provides for the making of such reports to the

1 Commissioner in such form and containing such informa-
2 tion as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commis-
3 sioner to perform his duties under this section.

4 DISAPPROVAL OF, AND FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH,
5 STATE PLANS

6 SEC. 903. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally dis-
7 approve any State plan submitted under this Act, or any
8 modification thereof, without first affording the agency ad-
9 ministering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a
10 hearing.

11 (b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable
12 notice and opportunity for hearing to the agency administer-
13 ing a State plan approved under one of the titles of this
14 Act, finds that—

15 (1) the State plan has been so changed that it no
16 longer complies with the provisions of this Act govern-
17 ing its original approval, or

18 (2) in the administration of the plan there is a
19 failure to comply substantially with any such provision,
20 the Commissioner shall suspend approval of the State
21 plan, and shall notify the agency administering the plan
22 of the suspension. When approval of a State plan has been
23 suspended by the Commissioner such approval shall remain
24 suspended until he is satisfied that there is no longer any
25 such failure to comply.

1 (c) (1) While approval of a State plan submitted
2 under title II is suspended by the Commissioner he shall
3 not award new scholarships to individuals certified to him
4 by the State Commission (or the Commissioner, in his dis-
5 cretion, may provide that the State Commission will not be
6 eligible to participate in the part of a program under the
7 title, or in the part of the State plan, which is affected by
8 the failure to comply).

9 (2) While approval of a State plan submitted under
10 title IV, part A of title VII, or section 902 is suspended by
11 the Commissioner he shall make no further payments under
12 that title, part, or section (as the case may be) for programs
13 in the State.

14 JUDICIAL REVIEW

15 SEC. 904. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the
16 Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval
17 of a State plan submitted under this Act, or with re-
18 spect to his final action under section 903 (b), such State
19 may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file in
20 the United States district court for the district in which
21 the capital of the State is located, a petition to review such
22 action. The petition for review shall (1) contain a concise
23 statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based and
24 (2) designate that part of the Commissioner's decision
25 sought to be reviewed.

1 (b) Notification of the filing of the petition for review
2 shall be given by the clerk of the court by mailing a copy of
3 the petition to the Commissioner.

4 (c) No costs or docket fees shall be charged or imposed
5 with respect to any judicial review proceedings, or appeal
6 therefrom, taken under this Act.

7 (d) Upon receipt of the petition for review the Commis-
8 sioner shall, within twenty days thereafter, certify and file
9 in the court the record on review, consisting of the complete
10 transcript of the proceedings before the Commissioner. No
11 party to such review shall be required, by rule of court or
12 otherwise, to print the contents of such record filed in the
13 court.

14 (e) The court after review may dismiss the petition or
15 deny the relief prayed for, or may suspend, modify, or set
16 aside, in whole or in part, the action of the Commissioner,
17 or may compel action unlawfully withheld. The judgment
18 of the court shall be subject to review as provided in section
19 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

20 METHOD OF PAYMENT

21 SEC. 905. Payments under this Act to any individual
22 or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher
23 education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant
24 or contract, may be made in installments, and in
25 advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of

1 grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpay-
2 ments or underpayments.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

4 SEC. 906. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
5 priated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for
6 each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary
7 for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

8 ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS AND BEQUESTS

9 SEC. 907. The Commissioner is authorized to accept
10 gifts, grants, bequests, or devises for carrying out the pro-
11 visions of this Act.

12 ALLOTMENTS TO TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

12 SEC. 908. The National Defense Scholarships reserved
14 by the Commissioner under section 205 (a), and the amounts
15 reserved by the Commissioner under sections 402 and
16 702 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among Alaska,
17 Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Vir-
18 gin Islands, according to their respective needs for the type
19 of assistance furnished under the part or title in which the
20 section appears.

21 ADVISORY COMMITTEES

22 SEC. 909. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval
23 of the Secretary, may appoint an advisory committee, or
24 advisory committees, to advise and consult with him with
25 respect to the administration of titles V, VI, and VIII

1 of this Act. Members of an advisory committee ap-
2 pointed under this section, while attending conferences or
3 meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive com-
4 pensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not
5 exceeding \$50 per diem, and while away from their homes
6 or regular places of business they may be allowed travel
7 expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as au-
8 thorized by law for persons in the Government service
9 employed intermittently.

10 (b) Any member of an advisory committee appointed
11 under this section is hereby exempted, with respect to such
12 appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284,
13 and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section
14 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U. S. C.,
15 sec. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (c)
16 of this section.

17 (c) The exemption granted by subsection (b) shall not
18 extend—

19 (1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connec-
20 tion with the appointee's Government service from any
21 source other than the private employer of the appointee
22 at the time of his appointment, or

1 (2) during the period of such appointment, and
2 the further period of two years after the termination
3 thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prose-
4 cution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against
5 the Government involving any matter concerning which
6 the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his
7 appointment during the period of such appointment.

A BILL

To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

By Mr. ELLIOTT

JULY 1, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

JULY 15, 1958

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

REPORT H. R. 13247

(Hearings on H. R. 13247)

A BILL

to amend the various laws and to authorize the Secretary of Education to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the several laws relating to the education of the deaf and dumb, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HART

March 1, 1907

Approved by the President on March 1, 1907

Published by the Government Printing Office

11. **SMALL BUSINESS.** Conferees agreed to file a conference report on S. 3651, to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns. p. D799
12. **EDUCATION.** Rep. Frelinghuysen inserted a statement by HEW Secretary Flemming favoring H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill, and explaining the provisions of the bill. p. 14925
13. **LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.** Rep. McCormack announced that the conference report on H. R. 13015, the military construction authorization bill, will be considered Wed., Aug. 6 (p. 14925). Also scheduled for consideration the same day are S. 4071, the farm bill, H. R. 11056, to regulate the imports of certain fruits and nuts, and H. R. 13580, to increase the public debt limit.

SENATE

14. **APPROPRIATIONS.** The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 13192, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1959 (S. Rept. 2204) (p. 14773). The Daily Digest states that the bill provides \$3.5 billion, a \$440 million increase over the House-passed figure (p. D795).
15. **SURPLUS DISPOSAL; FOREIGN TRADE.** Both Houses received the President's semi-annual report on Public Law 480 operations, Jan. 1-June 30, 1958. pp. 14771, 14881 (H. Doc. 431)
The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 3858, to authorize CCC to purchase flour and cornmeal for donation instead of being limited to having such products processed from its own stocks (S. Rept. 2196). p. 14773
Sen. Humphrey discussed health problems and our foreign policy in the Middle East and urged the importance of using surplus foods to reduce human suffering. pp. 14845-8
16. **LOANS.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 3333, to improve the insured loan program of the FHA (S. Rept. 2192). p. 14773
17. **FARM LABOR.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported an original bill/ S. 4232 to extend the Mexican farm labor program for 1 year (S. Rept. 2189). p. 14773
18. **FORESTRY.** Concurred in the House amendment of S. 1748, to add certain lands in Ida. and Wyo. to the Caribou and Targhee National Forests. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 14819
Sen. Morse stated that big timbermen were attempting to prevent the use of provisions in the Small Business Act of 1958 which would help smaller lumbermen by setting aside timber for them to cut, and urged that the Small Business Administration take its own course. p. 14862
19. **ROADS.** Passed H. R. 12776, to revise and codify the laws relating to "Highways," with an amendment substituting the language of S. 3953 as reported by the Senate committee. S. 3953 was indefinitely postponed. pp. 14819-32
20. **DESERT-LAND ENTRIES.** Concurred in the House amendments to S. 359, to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of land aggregating less than 320 acres and forming a compact unit. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 14818

21. RECLAMATION. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 4002, to authorize the Grey Reef Dam and Reservoir as a part of the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin Project. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 14818
The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 3648, to authorize the Interior Department to construct and operate the Navaho Indian Irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project (S. Rept. 2198); and S. 1887, to authorize the Interior Department to construct the San Luis unit, Central Valley Project, Calif., and to enter into an agreement with the State to operate it (S. Rept. 2202). p. 14773
22. LANDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6542, to authorize the conveyance of certain forest lands to Dayton, Wyo. (S. Rept. 2194); and H. R. 11800, to authorize the sale of certain ARS lands and buildings to Clifton, N. J. (S. Rept. 2193). p. 14773
Sen. Morse discussed the formula requiring payment of at least 50% of the appraised fair market value for lands to be transferred to local agencies for public purposes, and 100% if for private purposes, which he has insisted on since 1946, in connection with a bill to dispose of certain property in Roseburg, Ore. pp. 14857-62
23. HALL OF FAME. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. Con. Res. 295, favoring the establishment of a Hall of Fame for Agriculture (S. Rept. 2190). p. 14773
24. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 4151, to establish uniform provisions for the transfer of acreage allotments when the landowner is displaced by an agency having the right of eminent domain (S. Rept. 2195). p. 14773
25. IMPORTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 2142, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act so as to extend restrictions on the importation of certain citrus fruits and figs, (S. Rept. 2191). p. 14773
26. PURCHASING. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendments S. 3224, to assist small business firms to obtain a fair share of Government purchases and contracts and to expedite Government procurement (S. Rept. 2201). p. 14773
27. FISHERIES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported with an amendment in the nature of a substitute bill, S. 3229, the proposed Federal Fisheries Assistance Act of 1958. p. D796
28. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 337, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. p. D796
29. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. S. 4162, to provide for the cancellation of certain uncollectible loans and operating losses under Title III of the Defense Production Act, was made the unfinished business. p. 14817
30. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Humphrey inserted an article by the manager of the Colo. Rural Electric Association urging greater independence of the REA administrator from USDA control. pp. 14839-40

conditions the heart of this vital industry has moved further to the west along several Gulf Coast States, including of course, Florida. Tung is a very valuable crop with qualities and characteristics that make it of vital importance. This crop, although of minor nature as far as gross sales are concerned, is the major source of revenue for hundreds and hundreds of farmers.

Other miscellaneous provisions extends the Veterans and Armed Services milk program to December 31, 1961, and permits cotton donation to schools for educational purposes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to stress again that I am not satisfied with the House amendment to S. 4071. I do not believe any single member of the House Committee on Agriculture is satisfied with the amendment but we are in agreement by a vote of 28 to nothing as far as our committee is concerned that this is the best piece of legislation that we can have any hopes of getting passed during this session of Congress. It is for that reason that we bring this amendment to the House. I fear this legislation will not materially help the small farmer, but it will, I hope, keep his condition from deteriorating further. That does not mean to say that this House is not charged with the responsibility of attempting further help for the farmers of America. Our total population in America consumed 11 percent more farm produced foods, including more meats and other animal products in 1957 than in 1952, yet our farmers received \$600 million less for that larger volume of production in 1957 than for the more limited volume in 1952. And, in contrast, consumers paid food processors and marketing middlemen \$6.1 billion, or 25 percent, more in 1957 than in 1952 for hauling, processing and handling the food between the farm gate and the retail counter. Thus, in 5 years—comparing 1957 with 1952—we have witnessed these deteriorating circumstances in agriculture: total farm production, including fiber and other nonfood crops up 6 percent in spite of record carryovers; farm prices, down 16 percent; farm parity ratio, down 18 percentage points; realized net farm income, down 19 percent, lowest point since 1942; purchasing power of that farm income, down 23 percent, lowest since 1940; farm debt, at a record high, above \$20 billion; farm population declined 12 percent, from 24,283,000 in 1952 to 20,396,000 in 1957.

In 1952 net income per farm in the United States averaged \$2,789; in 1957, 5 years later, net income per farm had dropped to \$2,496. In contrast the income of the average nonfarm family of 3 persons increased from \$5,499 in 1952 to \$6,135 in 1957.

In 1957 the returns to all farmworkers for their labor and management reached a low of 69 cents an hour, while the average wage of industrial workers reached a high of \$2.07 an hour.

These facts are taken from the report of the House Committee on Agriculture that accompanied the original omnibus bill, H. R. 12954.

Despite these calamitous facts we have many Members of Congress who decry

price supports and other programs for farmers on the basis that these prices are a great burden on the consumers. The truth of the matter is over and over again as we have tried to emphasize to the House that if you give the farmer nothing for his produce, the consumer will pay just about the same price in the market place. The larger profits will be passed on to the middlemen. Time and time again I have pointed out that the price the farmer receives for his produce, many times, has nothing in the world to do with the price the consumer pays for it in the market place. If the members of this House want to be fair to the American farmer, they must help us fight for a parity ratio that is fair. A ratio that will give the farmer the same equitable treatment as other segments of the economy. Our amendment to S. 4071 does not give the farmer all he needs. It is, however, a tremendous improvement on the original S. 4071 and for that reason, I sincerely hope the House passes the committee amendment.

STRENGTHENING OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD regarding Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a statement made today by our new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming. Mr. Flemming has had considerable experience in educational matters and his news in the merits of H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill, deserve close attention.

Secretary Flemming's statement is as follows:

I believe that H. R. 13247, with the improvements suggested by the President, should be enacted into law at this session of the Congress.

The United States has developed an educational system that is second to none. Last October, however, our attention as a Nation was focused on the following conclusions:

1. There are serious defects in our educational system.

2. These defects must be eliminated in order to make it possible for a larger percentage of our people to realize their highest potential.

3. Failure of a large percentage of our people to realize their highest potential will have a serious adverse effect on our ability to preserve our free institutions.

In brief, last October we were convinced that we faced an emergency in the field of education. We were right. And we still face that emergency, an emergency that calls for action. Every day that we delay we are deliberately wasting our greatest resource.

Many ideas have been advanced as to the part that the Federal Government should play in dealing with this emergency. H. R. 13247 represents a substantial meeting of minds on the part of the executive branch and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. It provides for a 4-year emergency program and offers an effective vehicle for those who want to substitute action for talk. It will make the following positive contributions in the direction of helping a larger percentage of

our people to realize their highest potential:

1. It will provide reasonable amounts in scholarships and loans for those who are exceptionally well qualified to pursue work in the field of higher education, with special emphasis, in the award of scholarships, being placed on those who have superior capacity or preparation in mathematics, science, or a modern foreign language.

It is clear that, as the President has pointed out, the inclusion of a provision for loan funds in the total program should be taken into consideration in determining the amount that is to be made available for scholarships.

Also, I concur wholeheartedly in the President's belief that scholarship assistance should be given only to those who need it. I believe that it would be wrong for the Federal Government to provide any of the taxpayers' money for a student who has no need for it.

2. It will provide moderate grants to States and to educational institutions for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language teaching in our public elementary and secondary schools. These funds, wisely administered, can help to eliminate one of the most serious defects in our educational system.

3. It will provide reasonable amounts for fellowships designed to reduce the critical shortage of teachers in the field of higher education. Until this shortage is met our educational system is sure to deteriorate in the face of a definitely established need for increased strength.

4. It will provide moderate grants to States for improving our testing and counseling services. Such grants will help make available to students in our secondary schools the facts and counsel they need in order to assure their maximum intellectual development.

5. It will provide limited funds for additional research in the use of radio, television, motion pictures, etc., for education. The intelligent use of these mediums will provide the Nation with a much larger number of well-trained men and women than will be the case if we ignore these possibilities.

6. It will provide us with more adequate statistical information relative to our educational needs. Our present inadequacies in this area make it difficult for us to agree on sound national programs in the field of education. The time has come to stop complaining about these inadequacies and to put into effect a program that will correct them.

Some allege that this program is too much. Others allege it is too little. I feel that all who are interested in strengthening our educational system should support it so that we will not, in the future, be accused of being too late.

The Federal Government does have a responsibility for leadership in strengthening our total educational system. If we act, government at all levels, as well as private individuals and organizations, will respond to our leadership. Inaction will do irreparable damage.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief announcement that the conference report on the bill H. R. 13015, the military construction bill, will come up tomorrow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on official business on July 31, at the time of rollcall No.

150. I favor the resolution, House Resolution 659, and if I had been present would have voted "yea."

EXPOSING A FABRICATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on the civil rights bill on June 7, 1957, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] included in his remarks a "quotation" from a document entitled "A Racial Program for the 20th Century," allegedly written in 1912 by an Israel Cohen, described as a leading English Communist. The quotation was designed to show that agitation for civil rights for Negroes was a plot concocted by foreign Communists.

As soon as the quotation appeared in the Record on the authority of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, it was seized upon by all the professional anti-Semitic hatemongers to make a different point from the one intended by the gentleman from Mississippi. At the same time, knowledgeable anti-Communists, who really understood the history and nature of that un-American movement, recognized the quotation on its face as a counterfeit and challenged it. For one thing, there was no Communist Israel Cohen; there was no such pamphlet known to any library; and, indeed, there was no Communist Party in England in 1912.

The Washington Star, a highly reputable newspaper from whose letters-to-the-editor columns the gentleman from Mississippi picked up the quotation, undertook an intensive check both in England and in this country in an effort to pin down the source of the statement. After months of research the Star, in an article published February 18, 1958, concluded that the quotation was completely phony and a deliberate fabrication.

The article in the Star, which is an outstanding example of painstaking and responsible journalism, is as follows:

STORY OF A PHONY QUOTATION—A FUTILE EFFORT TO PIN IT DOWN—"A RACIAL PROGRAM FOR THE 20TH CENTURY" SEEMS TO EXIST ONLY IN SOMEBODY'S IMAGINATION

This story begins, insofar as it concerns us, with the Star's publication last March of a letter from R. A. Hester, then the chairman of the Montgomery County Chapter, Maryland Petition Committee, Inc.

In the course of his letter, commenting on a news story, Mr. Hester wrote that—

"Over 40 years ago, an English Communist, Israel Cohen, wrote:

"We must realize that our party's most powerful weapon is racial tension. By pounding into the consciousness of the dark races that for centuries they have been oppressed by the whites, we can mold them to the program of the Communist Party. In America we will aim for subtle victory. While inflaming the Negro minority against the whites, we will endeavor to instill in the whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes. We will aid the Negroes to rise in prominence in every walk of life, in the professions and in the world of sports

and entertainment. With this prestige, the Negroes will be able to intermarry with the whites and begin a process which will deliver America to our cause.' (From 'A Racial Program for the Twentieth Century' 1912.)"

The letter and quotation remained unchallenged until the following June, when the Star received a letter (for publication) from Herman Edelsberg, director of the Washington Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

In his letter Mr. Edelsberg said that Representative ABERNETHY of Mississippi, during debate on the civil rights bill, had placed the quotation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (June 7). Mr. ABERNETHY had explained that "Israel Cohen, a leading Communist in England, in his A Racial Program for the 20th Century, wrote, in 1912" the passage referred to above. Mr. Edelsberg said his own research convinced him that the alleged quotation was a fabrication, that no such publication as A Racial Program for the Twentieth Century was known either to the Library of Congress or the National Union Catalog, which summarizes holdings of 800 principal libraries in the United States. Furthermore, he said, he had been unable to find any information that might serve to identify an English Communist, Israel Cohen.

The Star printed Mr. Edelsberg's letter with an editor's name, explaining that Mr. Hester, when asked by the Star to give the source of the alleged quotation, said he had read it in some newspaper, but could not remember which one. The Star apologized for having printed the letter from Mr. Hester without first establishing authenticity of the alleged quotation and stated that a subsequent check of immediately available sources revealed no such publication as A Racial Program for the Twentieth Century.

Publication of Mr. Edelsberg's letter seemed to close the incident until the latter part of July, when the Star received a letter from a reader, not for publication, taking issue with Mr. Edelsberg. She said that an Israel Cohen lived in London, was listed in the British Who's Who, that he had written extensively, was the author of numerous publications, and that the same quotation appearing in Mr. Hester's letter to the Star in March had previously appeared as an advertisement in the December 1956, issue of the Virginian published at Newport News, Va.

A letter was immediately dispatched to the editor of the Virginian requesting information as to the source of the alleged Cohen quotation.

The editor, William Stephenson, replied by reciting his own efforts to establish its source. "Personally," he wrote, "I have been forced to conclude that the 'quotation' is phony."

It had first appeared, Mr. Stephenson wrote, in a small rightist newspaper and was supplied to that newspaper by an employee of Congress. It was accepted in good faith by the publisher, but he does not possess a copy of A Racial Program for the 20th Century nor has he ever seen one. * * * Inquiries made in England have been equally fruitless.

Mr. Stephenson enclosed a photostat of a reference to Israel Cohen in Who's Who in World Jewry which contained his London address.

Within a few days after the receipt of the letter from Mr. Stephenson, the Star received a letter from Everette Severe, the new chairman of the Montgomery County chapter of the Maryland Petition Committee, Inc. Mr. Severe wrote:

"On July 15, a director of the Maryland Petition Committee, Mr. E. T. Smith, received a letter from Mr. Eustace Mullins, Box 1785, Chicago 90, Ill. Mr. Mullins, who was for-

merly with Senator McCarthy's office, gave us permission to quote his letter, which read, in part, as follows: "The Cohen quote was copied by me from a Zionist publication while doing research work at the Library of Congress in 1952. It has since been reprinted widely in many publications. Congressman ABERNETHY inserted it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after it had been generally circulated for 3 years. I do not have my files with me in Chicago, or I could give you the exact name and date of the publication in which the Cohen statement appeared. I used this quotation more than 3 years ago, and have not had occasion to refer to it since, because it was never questioned."

A letter was written to Mr. Mullins at the Chicago address. It related the circumstances and requested him to furnish some clue to the source of the alleged quotation, or to the location of his files, with the understanding that the Star would then undertake the research, following any lead that Mr. Mullins might furnish, to run the quotation down.

Mr. Mullins promptly responded, writing on stationery of the American Humane Church, Route 1, Huntley, Ill. The stationery described him as Rev. Eustace Mullins, director, Society for the Propagation of the Human Faith.

Said Mr. Mullins: "I had done research on the writings of one Israel Cohen, a Communist, several years ago, but I do not have my files available. At any rate, Mr. Edelsberg seems determined to make a political issue of the matter, and the church feels that I should devote my time to religious problems."

He concluded his letter by inviting the Star to join his church in its crusade against the barbarous Hebrew method of slaughtering meat animals.

The Star considered Mr. Mullins' letter to be a revealing evasion of the question of where he got the quotation, and wrote to Israel Cohen, now nearly 80 years old, living in London. He was asked if he could shed any light on the matter.

Mr. Cohen promptly replied, in his own clear handwriting, that he was astonished. "I have never written a book, pamphlet or article under the title 'A Racial Program for the Twentieth Century,' or under any title resembling this or any subject relating to it. I have never been a Communist or had any sympathy with the movement. In 1912 I was living in Berlin, where I worked in the Secretariat of the World Zionist Organization and acted as correspondent of the Glasgow Herald. I never visited America until the fall of 1931. I was there for only 2 weeks and did not write anything political while there. I published my autobiography under the title 'A Jewish Pilgrimage' last November. If you can get a copy * * * you will see that I could not possibly have written the statement. I am very curious myself to learn who this Israel Cohen was who wrote it. Why not ask the writer who sent you the letter? He ought to be able to tell you where he found the statement, whether in a book, pamphlet or magazine. * * * I have never known of an American Jewish writer having the same name as myself. My career is set forth in Who's Who and in the catalog of the British Museum. I am credited with a long list of books, pamphlets, and so forth, but none of them has anything to do with communism or the Negro question."

The Star next requested a research assistant at the Library of Congress to make a thorough search, first, for a publication, A Racial Program for the Twentieth Century, by Israel Cohen or by anybody else; second, for the alleged quotation from the works of Mr. Cohen. The research was fruitless in both its aims.

The Star next requested the director of the Jewish Information Bureau, Inc., 250 West 57th Street, New York, to make a search for

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 7, 1958
For actions of August 6, 1958
85th-2d, No. 134

CONTENTS

Accounting.....	23,40		
Appropriations.....	7		
Atomic energy.....	10		
Budgeting.....	5,40		
Cornmeal.....	25		
Defense production.....	25		
Economic situation.....	28		
Education.....	9		
Electrification.....	2,26		
Fair trade.....	31		
Farm committeemen.....	25	Livestock.....	1
Farm loans.....	40	Meatpackers.....	37
Farm program.....	1,27	Military construction.....	8
Federal-State relations.....	22	Minerals.....	16,24
Feed.....	1	Organization.....	2
Flour.....	25	Personnel.....	11,39
Foreign trade.....	3,19	Price control.....	38
Fruits and nuts.....	6	Property.....	12
Imports.....	6	Public debt.....	4,32
Inspection services.....	13	Public Law 480.....	19
Legislative program.....	18,25	Reports.....	14
		Research.....	14
		Small business.....	17
		Soil conservation.....	34
		Statehood.....	15,30
		Surplus commodities.....	19
		Surplus property.....	21
		Tobacco.....	20
		Trade agreements.....	29
		Water.....	33,35
		Wheat.....	25
		Wool.....	36

HIGHLIGHTS: House rejected farm bill. House passed bill to increase public debt limit. House received conference report on trade agreements extension bill. House Rules Committee reported resolution to agree to Senate amendments to accrued expenditures budgeting bill. House committee ordered reported bill to grant REA Administrator more authority. Sen. Humphrey urged long-term extension of Public Law 480. Sen. Ellender introduced bill to provide revolving fund for USDA loans.

HOUSE

- FARM PROGRAM.** Voted, 210 to 186, to suspend the rules and pass S. 4071, the farm bill. Since this was not the required two-thirds vote for passage under suspension of the rules, the bill was rejected. p. 15049
Rep. Anderson stated that food prices are increasing and that he has "predicted time and again consumers do not benefit from legislation and administrative action to depress farm commodity prices." p. 15044
Rep. Harvey discussed the farm situation, particularly with regard to feed and livestock, and urged enactment of legislation for increased research on the industrial utilization of farm products. pp. 15085-89
- ELECTRIFICATION; ORGANIZATION.** The Government Operations Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 11762, to provide that Sec. I of the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, giving the Secretary administrative control over all USDA agencies, shall not hereafter apply to REA. p. D805

3. FOREIGN TRADE. Received the conference report on H. R. 12591, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements (H. Rept. 2502). As reported the bill, among other things, extends the President's authority to enter into trade agreements for 4 years; restores a House provision that action found and reported by the Tariff Commission in an escape-clause proceeding to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury is to take effect if approved by the President or, if disapproved by the President, upon the adoption by both Houses of a concurrent resolution stating that the House and Senate approve the action so found and reported by the Tariff Commission to be necessary; and deletes a Senate amendment providing for the establishment of a bipartisan commission, the Commission on International Trade Agreement Policy, to study and recommend improvements in international trade agreement policies. pp. 15083-85-, 15115
4. PUBLIC DEBT. Passed without amendment, 286 to 108, H. R. 13580, to increase the public debt limit to \$285 billion. pp. 15048-49
5. BUDGETING. The Rules Committee reported a resolution to agree to the Senate amendments to H. R. 8002, the accrued expenditures budgeting bill. pp. 15049-50, 15114
6. FRUIT AND NUT IMPORTS. Voted, 136 to 109, to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 11056, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act so as to extend restrictions on certain imported citrus fruits, dried fruits, walnuts, and dates. Since this was not the required two-thirds vote for passage under suspension of the rules, the bill was rejected. p. 15050
7. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 12738, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1959 (H. Rept. 2503). pp. 15081-83
8. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Agreed, 256 to 135, to the conference report on H. R. 13015, the military construction authorization bill. pp. 15044-48
9. EDUCATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 13247, to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical needs. (pp. 15050, 15114) Rep. Dwyer spoke on the need for enactment of this legislation. (pp. 15106-07)
10. ATOMIC ENERGY. Rep. Holifield criticized the President's statement taking exception to certain provisions of the atomic energy authorization bill, including the development of certain power reactors. pp. 15103-106
11. PERSONNEL. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 1903, to authorize the payment of transportation expenses for Presidential appointees assigned to duty posts outside the continental U. S. (H. Rept. 2487). p. 15115
The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11098, to repeal Section 1505 of the Social Security Act to provide that in determining eligibility of Federal employees for unemployment compensation their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws. p. D807
12. PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 13673, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations (H. Rept. 2494). p. 15115

AGREEING TO THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 8002

AUGUST 6, 1958.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 674]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 674, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



House Calendar No. 283

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. RES. 675

[Report No. 2481]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 6, 1958

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the
4 Union for the consideration of H. R. 13247 to strengthen
5 the national defense and to encourage and assist in the
6 'expansion and improvement of educational programs to
7 meet critical national needs; and for other purposes. After
8 general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and con-
9 tinue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and
10 controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member
11 of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be
12 read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the

1 conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment,
2 the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House
3 with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the
4 previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill
5 and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening
6 motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 283

85TH CONGRESS
2D Session

H. RES. 675

[Report No. 2481]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 13247,
a bill to strengthen the national defense and
to encourage and assist in the expansion and
improvement of educational programs to
meet critical national needs; and for other
purposes.

By Mr. MADDEN

AUGUST 6, 1958

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
printed

Wilson, Calif.
Wolverton
Yates

Young
Younger

Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—108

Abbott
Abernethy
Alexander
Andrews
Ashmore
Barden
Baring
Baumhart
Beamer
Berry
Betts
Blitch
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Brownson
Budge
Byrne, Ill.
Cannon
Cederberg
Church
Collier
Cramer
Cunningham,
Nebr.
Davis, Ga.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Fino
Flynt
Forrester
Fountain
Grant
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn

NOT VOTING—36

Adair
Bentley
Bolling
Brooks, La.
Buckley
Burdick
Carnahan
Christopher
Colmer
Coudert
Davis, Tenn.
Dies

Eberharter
Evins
Friedel
Gordon
Gregory
Hillings
Hull
Jenkins
Kilburn
Lesinski
Loser
McIntire

McMillan
Machrowicz
Mason
Michel
Morris
Moulder
Neal
Radwan
Shuford
Sieminski
Smith, Kans.
Spence

The yeas and nays were ordered.
The question was taken and there
were—yeas 210, nays 186, not voting 34.
as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—210

Abbott
Abernethy
Albert
Alexander
Anderson,
Mont.
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashmore
Aspinall
Avery
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Baring
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blitch
Boggs
Bonner
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Breeding
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Budge
Burdick
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Coad
Coffin
Cooley
Cunningham,
Nebr.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Dellay
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dixon
Dollinger
Donohue
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Everett
Fascell
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Gary

NAYS—186

Addonizio
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Arends
Ashley
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Betts
Blatnik
Boland
Bolton
Bosch
Bow
Broomfield
Brown, Mo.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broynhill

Henderson
Herlong
Heseltun
Hess
Hiestand
Hoffman
Hollfield
Holt
Holtzman
Hosmer
Hyde
Jackson
James
Johansen
Johnson
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelly, N. Y.
Knutson
Lafore
Laird
Lankford
Latham
Lipscomb
McCarthy
McCalloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntosh
McVey
Macdonald
Mack, Wash.
Mailliard
Marshall

Adair
Bentley
Bolling
Brooks, La.
Buckley
Burdick
Carnahan
Christopher
Colmer
Davis, Tenn.
Dies
Eberharter

Martin
May
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Moore
Morano
Mumma
Nicholson
Nimtz
Norblad
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Konski
Osmers
Osterlag
Patterson
Pelly
Pillon
Poff
Powell
Prouty
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Robison, N. Y.
Robison, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
St. George
Saylor

NOT VOTING—34

Evins
Friedel
Gordon
Gregory
Hillings
Hull
Jenkins
Kilburn
Kirwan
Lesinski
Loser
McIntire

So, two-thirds not having voted in
favor thereof, the motion to suspend the
rules and pass the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following
pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moulder and Mr. Buckley for, with
Mr. Hull against.
Mr. Eberharter and Mr. Machrowicz for,
with Mr. Radwan against.
Mr. Bentley and Mr. Colmer for, with Mr.
Mason against.
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana and Loser for, with
Mr. Friedel against.
Mr. Lesinski and Mr. Morris for, with Mr.
Kilburn against.
Mr. Evins and Mr. Burdick for, with Mr.
Hillings against.
Mr. McIntire and Mr. Gordon for, with
Mr. Jenkins against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bolling with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Neal.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Michel.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts
changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DELLAY changed his vote from
"nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

PROVIDING IMPROVED METHODS OF STATING BUDGET ESTIMATES AND ESTIMATES FOR DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIA- TIONS

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on
Rules, reported the following privileged
resolution (H. Res. 674, Rept. No. 2480),
which was referred to the House Calen-
dar and ordered to be printed:

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following
pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Moulder
against.
Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. Dies against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bolling with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Neal.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Loser with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Michel.

The result of the vote was an-
nounced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1958

The SPEAKER. The unfinished busi-
ness is the suspension of the rules and
the passage of the bill (S. 4071) to
provide more effective price, production
adjustment, and marketing programs
for various agricultural commodities.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on
suspending the rules and passing the
bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, on that
I ask for the yeas and nays.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill (H. R. 8002), with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby, agreed to.

QUALITY REGULATION OF IMPORTED AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 11056) to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, of 1933, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken, and the Chair being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 136, noes 109.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 675, Rept. No. 2480), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE OF JAMES C. OLIVER AGAINST ROBERT HALE, FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, MAINE

Mr. ASHMORE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 676, Rept. No. 2482), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That Robert Hale was duly elected as Representative from the First Congressional District of the State of Maine in the 85th Congress and is entitled to his seat.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 657 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13507) to provide for reporting and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the pending Resolution 657 calls up for consideration H. R. 13507 which provides for reporting and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefits plans. The resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours general debate.

I wish to commend the chairman and members of the Education and Labor Committee for reporting this legislation so that it can be considered by the House during this session of Congress. Unfortunately, a relatively small number of so-called labor leaders have been either negligent or dishonest with their membership by dissipating, misappropriating, or through unsound investments jeopardize the funds which are established for the purpose of protecting the future welfare and security of their organization's membership.

The objective of this bill is to guarantee the participants and their beneficiaries of the millions of workers and their families who have a partial interest in ownership in moneys of this nature. It is estimated that almost 80 million persons are relying on private benefit plans and approximately \$30 billion is invested therein. The subcommittee and the full Committee on Education and Labor has given considerable thought and study to this important problem for several years. The committee believes that periodical filing of sworn affidavits concerning the amounts, investments, and all essential facts concerning welfare funds will serve as a preventive against dishonesty and misappropriations of these funds by the administrators charged with their care. The participants and beneficiaries of these funds, if they are familiar and acquainted with the true status of the administration thereof will be sufficient protection to keep these funds intact and solvent for the purposes for which they are originally intended.

This bill will place the least possible burden by way of cost and operation

upon the Nation's taxpayer in general. This bill does not provide punitive regulations but the committee after long study feels that exposure of facts and reporting statistics on pension funds will be a practical method of enforcement. Each State and local community through the Attorney General and county prosecutors can prosecute for any misappropriation or criminal violations because of dishonest administrators who are responsible to employees for the care and custody of welfare and pension funds.

The bill also provides that the description, facts, and data of any employee welfare or pension benefits plan shall be published within 90 days of the effective date of this act or within 90 days after the establishment of such plan whichever is later. The bill also provides that the pension welfare operations plans shall be published, signed and sworn to by the person or the persons defined as the administrator and also includes names and addresses of all persons directly or indirectly connected with the administration of these funds. In addition, the bill outlines all other facts and essential information to which the membership of these various pension plans are entitled to know.

Judging from the exposures revealed from congressional investigations, corruption, dishonesty, and deceit in the operation of welfare and pension funds was committed because the vast membership had no knowledge or method of securing information regarding the true facts, status, and operations connected with the administration of these vast sums of moneys entrusted to officers of certain unions. No doubt, it will be contended by certain Members during this debate that additional restrictive and regulatory legislation should be enacted at this time involving exposures from congressional committees investigations of labor management relations. It is not the purpose of this bill to go into the extended scope of all labor management relations because of the weeks and months of hearings and other preparations involved in this long and complex undertaking. I do hope that the Members debate this legislation with sincerity and commonsense. As a former member of the Labor and Education Committee 10 years ago I was sorry at that time to hear Members denounce organized labor in general terms and we have regretted some of our mistakes on numerous occasions since the Taft-Hartley law was enacted. We have had unfortunate bitterness, strikes, and labor difficulties since that law was passed. I hope the Members remember that Communist agitators seek first to control labor and second, our schools. With the exception of a few out of approximately 50,000 labor officials we can thank labor leaders in America for defeating Communist infiltration into American labor. I do think this Congress before adjournment should favorably enact the pending legislation so that working men and women throughout the Nation can have the mental satisfaction to know the future security for them and their families will be guaranteed by the enacting of legislation which will prevent any dis-

our committee that they cannot spend the millions required to achieve economic atomic power. Private proposals have slowed down to a stop for all practical purposes. A few projects are being built, and very few of these with exclusively private funds. Even those few are being aided with Government funds in one way or another. Enriched fuel is being furnished by the Government for fuel rod inventory purposes with low interest rental—waiver of heavy water charges—free research and development information running into many millions of dollars of taxpayers funds: all of this free Government help is being given. But this is not all. The Government has had to build large experimental-type reactors such as the sodium reactor experiment at Santa Susana, Calif.; the experimental boiling-water reactor at Argonne; an advanced model of the fast breeder type of reactor costing \$29 million; and has granted \$7 million to help the Pennsylvania Power and Light Co. in their project—all of this because private industry has failed to do the job they promised they could do in 1954 and 1955.

Then there are the cooperative projects where the Government finances, builds, and owns the reactors—the projects of consumers of Nebraska; Piqua, Ohio; Elk River, Minn.; and Chugach, Alaska. So when the President advocates further delay in the gas-cooled natural uranium type of reactor you can understand the skepticism which some of us on the joint committee have.

Industry has had, since 1953, the opportunity to build such a reactor. But, the Strauss program had no room for it. So, today we do not have a reactor of this type to meet British competition in the world market.

The President's promise to ask for funds at some indefinite time in the future, "if this proves at that time to be the sound course of action," has a hollow sound. It has a familiar sound, too. It is full of weasel words, hedges, and loopholes. It sounds like a certain news release of the old Atomic Energy Commission which announced the detection of the underground atomic explosion in Nevada in these words:

The earth waves were recorded at seismological stations at Los Angeles, about 250 miles, airline, from the shot mesa. This was the maximum distance at which the shock was recorded.

Days later, the Atomic Energy Commission had to admit that—

Seismological stations of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey as far away as College, Alaska, about 2,320 miles from the shot mesa, recorded the earth waves.

DENIAL OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

I come now to the last project criticism of the President. Let me quote the President's own paragraph on this point:

Fourth, the bill authorizes construction research facilities totaling \$39 million in addition to those I requested and also the design of 4 power reactors. These are not undesirable projects, but they have been included without adequate consideration of other pressing governmental needs requiring funding in fiscal year 1959.

This lump sum of \$39 million is for the construction of vitally needed re-

search facilities, improvements of our basic research tools—the cyclotron and bevatron, additional laboratory equipment, and laboratories for the key problems of metallurgy and ceramic experimental facilities. This need was established by the testimony of our most distinguished scientists. Dr. Libby, the scientific member of the Commission, testified that in his opinion these projects were of top priority. The Joint Committee, I believe, was unanimous in their approval. The President admits that these are not undesirable projects. He rules them out on fiscal consideration alone.

BUDGET FREEZE WILL BE PRESIDENT'S RESPONSIBILITY

Now I have finished with the President's message. It means that the Budget Bureau will, at his orders, freeze these items, even though authorized and appropriated for by Congress in this session. It means unnecessary delay in scientific research and development in our laboratories. It means further delay in our atomic power program and it may mean a serious deficiency in our plutonium weapons 4 or 5 years from today. The President and his atomic adviser will bear the responsibility—not the Congress.

EURATOM

One closing note—the Joint Committee is being urged to rush through legislation for a huge international power reactor building program for six European nations, known as Euratom. It will cost the United States taxpayers in loans guarantees and research grants an unknown number of millions of dollars; present evidence indicates that \$700 million American tax dollars will be involved. The President has no qualms about this program which is uncertain and indefinite in many areas. The Atomic Energy Commission advocates haste in legislation and trust in future good intentions. Neither the President, the State Department, nor the Atomic Energy Commission are willing to follow the last paragraph of the President's message, although hundreds of millions of dollars, United States dollars, will be involved.

Here are his words:

I feel obliged to urge the Congress to guard more vigilantly against the ever-present tendency to burden the Government with programs such as those I have here described, the relative urgency and essentiality of which have not been solidly determined.

Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I append an editorial from the Washington Post of August 6, 1958, and a copy of the President's statement on the atomic energy authorization bill:

[From the Washington Post of August 6, 1958]

FISSIONABLE POLITICS

The President's grumpy message approving atomic power development legislation is a mark of the lingering influence wielded by Adm. Lewis Strauss. This is indeed a fretful sign. It means that the Euratom Treaty now before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee is being imperiled to appease the narrow views of Mr. Strauss. It also means that Mr. Strauss has undercut the influence of his successor, John A. McCone, as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Apparently,

in this maneuver, Mr. Strauss worked in harness with Under Secretary of Defense Donald Quarles, who, as a foe of additional preparation for limited war, has his own reasons for opposing the additional plutonium production facilities authorized by the \$386 million bill.

Mr. Strauss, who now wears the hat of Presidential adviser on atoms for peace, seemingly feels that public development of atomic power is akin to original sin. Thus, he apparently wheedled the President into making an unusual appeal to Congress to withhold appropriations for power projects authorized in the bill. One principal project is for a \$145 million plutonium production reactor. The question of whether more plutonium is necessary has become involved in the larger debate on limited nuclear wars. It is worth noting that the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not share Mr. Quarles' views on plutonium.

The net effect of this complex backstage jockeying is to infuriate members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, where the administration-backed Euratom legislation is awaiting action. Senator ANDERSON—unfortunately, we think—has implied that Euratom would be held as a hostage until the AEC appropriations were finally approved. Mr. ANDERSON and his colleagues have reason to be angry; after all, it was assumed that Mr. Strauss had retired from the AEC in fact as well as in name. But it would be an unworthy gesture for the Joint Committee to avenge itself by balking United States participation in Euratom. The many urgent reasons for joining in this program for developing atomic power in Europe have not been changed by the tricky politicking in the White House, and the Joint Committee would do itself credit by giving Euratom the enthusiastic endorsement it deserves.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON AEC AUTHORIZATION BILL

(WASHINGTON, August 4.—Following is the text of President Eisenhower's statement today on signing an authorization bill for the Atomic Energy Commission.)

Because it advances various atomic energy projects required for defense and peaceful purposes, I have today approved the bill H. R. 13121. Certain of its provisions are undesirable, however. On these I have a brief comment.

First, the bill authorizes \$145 million for an additional plutonium production reactor. Distinguished citizens have advocated this project, and I have carefully weighed their views. It needs to be understood, first, that military requirements govern our need for more plutonium production capacity, and, second, that the executive agency to which I look for dependable estimates of these requirements is the Department of Defense. That Department advises me—and I agree—that the necessity for more plutonium for military purposes is not established. The Department is now reassessing these requirements in a study which involves present and future weapons systems and force structures and their relation to the Nation's overall defense plans. Until this study is completed, and unless it solidly establishes to my satisfaction the necessity for so large a project, I consider it unsound to proceed.

OPPOSES POWER REACTOR

No less questionable is a provision making this reactor convertible for the generation of electrical power. The design would cost \$25 million more than a regular production reactor of comparable size. Fifty-nine million dollars more would be needed later to convert it for the generation of approximately 300,000 kilowatts of electric power for eventual sale to the public. Reliable economic data supporting this heavy expenditure by the Government are wholly lacking. Again, I consider it unsound to proceed.

Second, this legislation limits in various ways the Commission's management of atomic power development as well as other public or private participation in the program. By discouraging private proposals, these limitations impede rather than accelerate the achievement of economic atomic power. Moreover, they tend to involve the Government unnecessarily in the construction and operation of full-scale atomic power plants. The principle is well established that it is unwise to legislate detailed administrative and technical procedures.

Third—and a specific example of such limitations—the Commission's negotiations with industry for the construction of a \$51 million gas-cooled power reactor are made subject to unduly restrictive time limits.

ASSAULTS TIME LIMITS

Statutory time limits on complex technical and financial negotiations discourage industry proposals and hinder the Commission's orderly review and negotiations of those proposals. These restrictions could well force the Government into an avoidable capital investment of \$51 million and large operating expenditures for years to come.

In these circumstances, I suggest to Congress the wisdom of withholding appropriations at this session for the construction of this reactor. Should industry develop proposals for construction and operation of this type of reactor, I shall in the next session recommend appropriations to carry out the Commission's share of any cooperative arrangement. Alternatively, should it develop that a satisfactory industrial proposal will not be forthcoming in a reasonable time, I will request funds for its construction by the Government if this proves at that time to be the sound course of action.

Fourth, the bill authorizes construction of research facilities totaling \$39 million in addition to those I requested and also the design of four power reactors. These are not undesirable projects, but they have been included without adequate consideration of other pressing governmental needs requiring funding in fiscal year 1959.

I feel obliged to urge the Congress to guard more vigilantly against the ever-present tendency to burden the Government with programs, such as those I have here described, the relative urgency and essentiality of which have not been solidly determined.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I find an immense irony in the fact that, whereas it was generally considered the foremost problem facing our Nation at the beginning of this session of Congress, we are making an education bill virtually the last, if not the lowest priority, legislation of the year.

I am pleased that the House has finally decided to make it possible for action to be taken in this field; and I hope the Congress will quickly approve this step toward goals which in the past have been honored with so much more rhetoric than action—the goals of expanding the opportunities for education and of lifting the quality of education.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that, if the National Defense Education Act is enacted into law, it will mark the first time a general aid-to-education measure has become law in nearly 100 years—

since, to be exact, the Morrill Land-Grant-College Act of 1862 was passed.

In view of the historic nature of legislation that looks so promising today, I should like to pay tribute to the bipartisan cooperation of members of the House and Senate committees, of the leadership, and of the administration of President Eisenhower, for helping to make it possible for a truly pioneering measure to reach this encouraging point in its journey into the statute books.

Special recognition, I believe, should be accorded the esteemed retiring Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom, for his foresightedness and his intelligent and determined support of aid to education.

My own experience as a former chairman of the education committee of the New Jersey State Assembly leads me to welcome the general approach taken by the administration and by the committee in framing this program in the form of incentives—incentives to the States and localities and to the students, teachers, and educational institutions.

In none of their provisions do the two bills attempt to fulfill a demand or establish a comprehensive program. In each case, they identify needs and propose to stimulate the fulfillment of those needs through a minimum Federal contribution—a contribution which must be matched by others and in increasingly larger amounts.

In such a critically important field, and in one in which such great need exists, this is surely a proper Federal responsibility.

A further aspect of this legislation that appeals strongly to me is the obvious care which has been taken to minimize the role of central direction and practically to eliminate any central, or national, administration of any of the contemplated programs.

Standards, of course, will have to be established by the United States Office of Education in such areas as the scholarship aid program both to assure a reasonable degree of uniformity and to make certain that the neediest and most deserving students obtain the available assistance.

But, since conditions vary so markedly between sections of the country, and because the legislation aims at enlarging educational opportunities, it seems to me that wisdom dictated the decision to leave administration of the programs at State and local levels.

I am also pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is more broadly based than might at first seem to be the case. The proposals are heavily weighted toward the fields of science and mathematics, and—as important as these disciplines clearly are—other valuable and deserving fields are perhaps being ignored. But here, time and experience will tell.

In any event, several provisions wisely, I think, include assistance to students and teachers in nonscientific fields. Besides the additional emphasis on foreign language training—which I heartily applaud—the legislation offers help on an unrestricted basis through the expansion

of graduate education and the guidance program.

Even the national defense scholarships program is fairly broad. Despite the fact that special consideration will be given to applicants with superior capacity or preparation in science and mathematics, both proposals anticipate that students will be free to select their own course of study and to choose their own college or university.

This fact, I feel certain, will maximize the contribution to improved educational performance intended by the bills.

In a major respect, however, the proposed legislation is strikingly deficient. Even though it was purposely designed to meet an emergency need for better-trained people in the fields of science, mathematics and foreign languages, it completely ignores the need—which is just as immediate and just as vital to the interests of the United States—for the education of young men and women for the most demanding work on earth, the work of peace.

I refer to the dangerous shortage of skilled people who can represent our country intelligently, persuasively and realistically in the other nations of the world.

The United States, Mr. Speaker, even while it has reached the zenith of its military power, has nevertheless never been so dependent on the good will and cooperation of other nations as we are today. Virtually all our needs and interests, whether domestic or foreign, intimately involve the interests of other nations. If we are intelligently to protect our interests and resolve them amicably with those of other peoples, then we must have representatives abroad who thoroughly understand all the implications of these interests and the circumstances in which they must be worked out.

We do not today have sufficient numbers of such people on whom we can depend for skilled representation. It is not enough that our people know their own special field or their own country; they must also understand the language, culture, needs and interests of those among whom they will be living.

As a number of recent experiences have demonstrated, our own representatives abroad are not sufficiently knowledgeable in the ways of the rest of the world. The Vice President has forcefully called attention to the need for less striped-pants official diplomacy and more down-to-earth, people-to-people understanding.

We cannot achieve this higher standard of Foreign Service any more than we can obtain higher quality work in science—unless we provide the educational facilities and the encouragement for people to use them.

For some time, Mr. Speaker, I had considered offering an amendment to the education bill, either in committee or on the floor, to include Foreign Service training as eligible for some of the assistance provided by the legislation.

For at least two reasons, however, I have decided not to offer such an amendment. First, I believe the legislation may indirectly begin to provide for part

of this need through the help it proposes in establishing foreign language and area study centers designed to offer a better understanding of foreign languages and cultures presently ignored in the United States.

And second, I believe that the need for specialized training in the Foreign Service is greater than ever and can be met successfully only by a program aimed at accomplishing this purpose exclusively. Such is the purpose of my Foreign Service Academy bill, and I give notice today that I hope and expect to introduce this legislation next year and press for action on it.

It has been my experience, Mr. Speaker, on the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee that one of the major problems in any Federal grant-in-aid program is the possibility that Federal assistance, unless carefully administered, may tend to substitute for or replace efforts which were already being made or would otherwise have been made by the recipients of the aid. To the degree this is true, the whole point, purpose, and effectiveness of the Federal grant is lost.

This danger, I am pleased to note, has apparently been very much in the minds of those who drafted this legislation. The terms of both bills and the intent of the legislation as developed in the committee report make it clear that the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is meant to break new ground in some cases and in others to push ahead programs which, without Federal assistance, would lag far behind the need.

In a number of provisions, Federal aid is specifically limited to projects to be proposed as a direct result of the Federal incentive; in other sections, eligibility for assistance is made contingent on demonstrable expansion of programs already in effect.

In each such case, it is clear that congressional intent requires that assistance to institutions and individuals not be duplicative, that programs not be allowed simply to substitute reliance on Federal funds in place of private funds—in brief, that real need must be the primary criterion for help and that Federal aid will make possible progress that, without this help, would not have been possible.

I emphasize this aspect of the legislation, Mr. Speaker, because I consider it important that the Congress make a clear legislative history which will encourage the kind of scrupulous administration of these programs that will guarantee that Federal funds will accomplish the maximum amount of good.

I expect that such careful administration will be most necessary in the scholarship program. Here, especially, I believe it would be folly to award the scholarships solely on the basis of academic capabilities as determined by tests and other related criteria. The factor of demonstrable need must be an equally determining consideration.

The United States will benefit most from this program by assuring that the assistance is spread among worthy and deserving students just as far as it will go.

Of all the features of these education bills, Mr. Speaker, I am personally most

impressed by its consistent emphasis on quality—individual quality and individual excellence. The programs proposed by the bills aim to seek out and help students of ability on the college and graduate levels; they propose to improve methods of testing and guidance so as to recognize more quickly and effectively the talents and abilities of students; they stress, too, the development of more and better teachers; and through all the programs there is the constant purpose of raising the level of instruction and elevating the standards of academic achievement.

The progress of education in our country seems always to have fluctuated somewhat between emphasis on quality and emphasis on quantity. It is clearly time now to stress the qualitative needs, and this the legislation does. But, if educational performance in the United States is to improve steadily and sensibly, quality and quantity must always move upward hand in hand.

I would suggest, therefore, that the 86th Congress should study carefully the operation of this legislation and, on a continuing basis, assure that our national educational effort remains well balanced and capable of making constant progress.

Mr. Speaker, the national purpose which I believe is imbedded in this education bill has been strikingly and persuasively stated in the foreword of that extraordinary study of the Rockefeller Bros. Fund, entitled "The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America."

It would be appropriate here to quote the first few lines of this foreword:

There is no more searching or difficult problem for a free people than to identify, nurture, and wisely use its own talents. Indeed, on its ability to solve this problem rests, at least in part, its fate as a free people. For a free society cannot commandeer talent; it must be true to its own vision of individual liberty. And yet at a time when we face problems of desperate gravity and complexity an undiscovered talent, a wasted skill, a misapplied ability is a threat to the capacity of a free people to survive.

But there is another and deeper reason why a free nation must cultivate its own human potential; such a task reflects the very purposes for which a free society exists. If our Nation seeks to strengthen the opportunities for free men to develop their individual capacities and to inspire creative effort, our aim is as importantly that of widening and deepening the life purposes of our citizens as it is to add to the success of our national effort. A free society nurtures the individual not alone for the contribution he may make to the social effort, but also and primarily for the sake of the contribution he may make to his own realization and development.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. DWYER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from New Jersey who in her first term in this House has rendered such distinguished service. I am well aware of the splendid record she made as a member of the New Jersey House of Assembly for many years, and the very great interest which she has had in the subject of education.

She has truly left her mark in that State as a result of the work she did, and she has brought to this House a wealth of experience in this important matter. I appreciate the fact that she has emphasized this question today, and I am certain it will receive the consideration to which it is entitled.

Mrs. DWYER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. DWYER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. WEAVER. For the past 2 years it has been my privilege to serve with the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I am very familiar with her keen interest in those matters and on other matters that are constantly before us. I think she is doing a splendid job for the people she represents.

Mrs. DWYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. DWYER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor which drafted this bill we are going to consider tomorrow I very much appreciate the bipartisan note that was struck by the gentlewoman in her speech. This has been the chief means by which we have drafted this legislation in committee, and I think we on the committee are hoping to find a broad, bipartisan front tomorrow in presenting this bill.

I should also like to join the gentlewoman in her tribute to Secretary Folsom. We on our side of the committee found him a sturdy, effective advocate of Federal aid legislation, and it was a pleasure to work with Secretary Folsom while he was in that office.

Mrs. DWYER. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

(Mrs. DWYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

A RIGHT AND A DUTY IMPOSED BY THE LORD DENIED BY CERTAIN LABOR BOSSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when Adam and Eve sought and obtained too great a degree of knowledge, the Lord God sent Adam "forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken." He having been previously admonished that "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it was thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

And from that day to this, unless the individual stole, robbed, or illegally acquired wealth or property, or was the recipient of charity, he was forced, if he would live, to work.

The yellow-dog contract prevalent prior to 1935, the effect of which was to deprive a man of his right to work if he belonged to a labor union, was a vicious, wicked curtailment of the individual's right. It was outlawed in 1935.

Today, in many sections of the country, its opposite is insisted upon, and no man is permitted to work until he has joined and paid tribute to a labor union—this through the joint action of the employer and the union's representatives.

W. L. White, in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest, has written on that subject. Permit me to read:

THE RIGHT TO WORK: OUR HOTTEST LABOR ISSUE

(By W. L. White)

Should a man be forced to join or pay dues to a union in order to hold his job? Compulsory union membership is permitted under the Taft-Hartley Act, provided union leaders can persuade or force the employer to sign a union-shop contract. But the same Federal act provides that employees may not be compelled to join a union in those States which have right-to-work laws. Such laws are now in effect in 18 States.¹ Labor's top leaders bitterly denounce them, and they have become a hot political issue.

The basic arguments of the two sides may be simply stated. Those who support voluntary unionism—and hence the right-to-work laws—feel that nobody should be forced to join any organization against his will. They point out that many workers who do not wish to join a union are coerced by contracts requiring them to do so or lose their jobs.

Those opposed to right-to-work laws argue that, under the Taft-Hartley law, unions represent both members and non-members; any benefits won by the union accrue to all, and therefore all should pay. Laws banning union shop contracts, they say, encourage free riders.

There are many other issues involved. For example, the AFL-CIO, in its policy statement opposing right-to-work laws, argues that compulsory union membership is "clearly in line with our great American democratic tradition" because "union policies reflect the views of the majority of the workers. If the individual member objects to any policy, he can vote to change the union officials who have recommended that policy."

WHAT UNION MEMBERS SAY

Hear now the voice of Mary L. Crabtree, who testified before the Indiana legislature last year when it was considering a right-to-work measure. She was a member of Local 1048, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, she said, "because I have to be, I don't agree with the union's political views. I have been a member for 9 years, and have not yet found any effective way to protest any policy."

Cecil C. Roeder, of Anderson, Ind., told the lawmakers about union democracy within Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers. A member of its Local 622, he said: "For 7 years I was denied the right to belong to my local union because I came before the Indiana Senate committee in 1948 and testified in favor of a bill to outlaw the union shop. I favor this right-to-work bill because it will give the union back to its membership."

Milo Graber, who has worked 12 years in the International Harvester plant at Fort

Wayne, reported that its employees, in a National Labor Relations Board election, voted down compulsory unionism. "But in less than a year," he reported, "union and company officials negotiated a compulsory membership clause. If Indiana had had a right-to-work law in 1951, the company and union officials could not have forced the employees into union membership against their will."

ORGANIZING METHODS

In organizing members, unions sometimes use methods which leave little freedom of choice either to the employer or the workers. In California, which has no right-to-work law, an organizer for Teamster Local 912 approached the small firm of H. A. Rider & Son (it processes apple juice), asking that it sign a contract including a compulsory membership clause. When the Rider firm said it would sign only if the union got the consent of a majority of the employees, the organizer said this was "too much trouble." Instead, withdrawing his union shop demands, the organizer threw a picket line around the Rider plant in September 1956.

In theory the Taft-Hartley law provides a remedy, so Rider asked the NLRB for an election. It took 6 weary months to arrange one. Then, in a secret ballot, Rider's workers got their chance to speak. One voted for the Teamsters; 16 voted against.

The union, which said it "would not challenge the vote," nevertheless continued picketing. It took the NLRB 4 more tedious months—costly both to Rider and the workers—to decide that this post-election picket line also was unjustified.

Under a State right-to-work law, a judge can, in a few hours and by court injunction, stop illegal blockades established by unions to coerce compulsory membership clauses from employers. Many Californians want their local courts to have this power. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, leader of the United States Senate Republicans and also a candidate for Governor of California, urges such a measure. For this reason he has been marked for defeat by the AFL-CIO policy committee.

On the Democratic side in the Senate, FRANK LAUSCHE of Ohio also favors the right-to-work principle. It should be, he says, "just as sacred as any constitutional right."

CASE HISTORY: THE RAILROADS

The AFL-CIO charges that right-to-work laws "have the effect of keeping the unions from growing." But from 1934 until 1951, workers on American railroads were protected from compulsory unionism by a provision of the Railway Labor Act, and during those years most railway unions trebled in voluntary membership.

Nevertheless, in 1951, union leaders urged and got from Congress legislation permitting compulsory membership contracts with the railway companies. In this they were reversing the policies of the late Warren S. Stone, head of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

"I do not believe," said Stone, "in forcing a man to join a union. It is contrary to the principles of free government. We work willingly side by side with other engineers who do not belong to our union, though they enjoy the advantages we have obtained."

But other union leaders carried the day. Since then, through coaxing and strike threats, they have obtained compulsory union membership contracts with all the Nation's major railroads except the Louisville & Nashville. Latest to give in was the Santa Fe, which, during its long court battle, received hundreds of letters from employees imploring the company to stand firm.

A Santa Fe worker in La Jolla, Calif., asked why, if there really were "so many bleeding hearts" in favor of compulsory member-

ship, "has it never been submitted to the rank and file for a vote?"

It never was. Instead, union leaders asked their Santa Fe members to authorize a strike on the issue.

An employee in Escondido, Calif., then wrote: "How can the union ask us to go on strike without first allowing us to vote on whether or not we want a union shop?"

On some roads the unions held a vote on compulsory membership. A California employee of another railroad (who wrote the Santa Fe that "I have been a union member all my railroad life, but compulsory unionism must go if we are to remain a free people") described two such elections:

"Of approximately 4,500 switchmen, only 1,700 were allowed to vote; 1,000 voted for the union shop, and it was put in. In my class of yardmaster, only 200 out of approximately 350 were allowed to vote; compulsory membership was placed in effect with only 125 men voting for it. The union counted the ballots in both of these phony elections, so there was never any doubt of the outcome."

A Santa Fe union member wrote to the company from Riverside, Calif., "You probably understand that many employees fear to express their views, on account of possible union reprisals." Because of such fears, the names of the above-quoted railroad workers are not used here.

Are the fears justified? Consider the case of William T. Harrison, a veteran of 30 years' service with the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, 20 years a member of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, and for 7 a district chairman. Because his local opposed compulsory union membership by a vote of 208 to 1, Harrison dared to write his Congressman when, in 1951, the matter was coming up in Washington for a vote. For this offense, he was expelled by the Grand Lodge of his union.

UNION PUNISHMENTS

The two Federal laws which now legalize compulsory union membership (Taft-Hartley and the Railway Labor Act) attempt to give protection to union members, willing and unwilling, who work for companies whose businesses affect interstate commerce. Both stipulate that the union cannot drop a member, and thereby cause him to lose his job if he pays initiation fees and dues. The railway statute makes union assessments compulsory, while exempting the worker from union fines and penalties. But millions of Americans not working for companies whose businesses affect interstate commerce are unable to get any Federal protection. They may be punished, fined or expelled for as great a variety of reasons as there are union constitutions, unless State laws protect them.

The American Federation of Musicians has expelled members for criticizing its president, James C. Petrillo, now retired. A Cleveland carpenter was expelled for revealing union business in public when he protested that he should have been a delegate to a union meeting. A wireless telegrapher with a family to support was expelled from his union (and lost his job) only because he spoke up in a meeting against Communist leadership. Unions have expelled men for defaming a politician supported by union officers, and for opposing a bonus to be paid to union officials.

UNION DUES

George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, says: "We have got to wipe off the statute books the so-called right-to-work laws. They are destructive of the rights of union workers."

Often these rights seem illusory. For example, there is no legal ceiling on dues. In theory they cover the costs of collective bargaining. But, according to the testimony of witnesses appearing before the McClellan investigating committee, the International

¹ Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Virginia.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 3, 1958
For actions of August 7, 1958
85th-2d, No. 135

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....	36		
Annual leave.....	9		
Appropriations.....	5,23,39		
Area redevelopment.....	2		
Budgetary reserves.....	5		
CCC.....	20		
Contracts.....	27		
Cornmeal.....	20		
Cotton.....	16,35		
Desert land entries.....	24	Inspection services.....	10
Economic situation.....	29	International	
Education.....	8,33	organizations.....	9
Electrification.....	13	Legislative program.....	15,30
Fair trade.....	32	Manpower utilization.....	9
Farm program.....	16	Margarine.....	25
Farmer committees.....	18	Minerals.....	3,22
Financial management.....	9	Onion futures.....	17
Flour.....	20	Peanuts.....	36
Foreign trade.....	1,20	Personnel.....	9,26,38
Forestry.....	11,27	Reclamation.....	12,24
Imports.....	6	Rep. Hill.....	14
		School lunch.....	39
		School milk.....	39
		Seed wheat.....	19
		Small business.....	4,28
		Social security.....	34
		Surplus commodities.....	20,39
		TVA.....	31
		Unemployment	
		compensation.....	9
		Wheat.....	19
		Wildlife.....	37
		Wool.....	21

HIGHLIGHTS; House agreed to conference report to extend trade agreements authority. Sens. Aiken and Stennis urged compromise on the farm bill. Senate debated bill to revise procedures for election of CSS farmer committeemen. Senate agreed to conference report on bill prohibiting onion futures trading. Sens. Proxmire and Humphrey criticized farm program and size of USDA budget. House Rules Committee cleared area redevelopment bill. Both Houses agreed to conference report on Defense Department appropriation bill. Sen. Anderson submitted and discussed measure to re-establish acreage allotments and price support levels for 1959 upland cotton.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN TRADE. Agreed, 161 to 56, to the conference report on H. R. 12591, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements. pp. 15170-76
2. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. The Rules Committee granted a rule for consideration of S. 3683, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically depressed areas. p. D814
3. MINERALS. The Rules Committee announced agreement to hold hearings on S. 4036, to provide stabilization payments to certain mineral producers. p. D814
Agreed to the conference report on S. 2069, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act so as to promote the development of coal on the public domain. p. 15186

House - Aug 7, 1958

4. **SMALL BUSINESS.** Agreed to the conference report on S. 3651, to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns. pp. 15182-86
5. **APPROPRIATIONS.** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 12738, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1959, and acted on amendments in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 14176-82, 15146-7 (The conferees deleted the requirement for reports on budgetary reserves, but requested that the Budget Bureau arrange for such reports.)
6. **IMPORTS.** Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6006, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement of the Antidumping Act. pp. 15186-87
7. **CONTRACTS.** Passed as reported H. R. 11749, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, until June 30, 1959. pp. 15188-89
8. **EDUCATION.** Began debate on H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill, after agreeing, 265 to 108, to a Rules Committee resolution for debate on the bill. pp. 15192-218
9. **PERSONNEL.** The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported H. R. 9407, with amendment, to provide additional opportunity for certain employees to obtain career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive service (H. Rept. 2506); and S. 4004, without amendment, to encourage transfers of Federal employees for service with international organizations (H. Rept. 2509). p. 15231
The Foreign Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. 3195, to authorize certain retired Federal personnel to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries (H. Rept. 2521). p. 15232
The Post Office and Civil Service Committee issued a report on the study of manpower utilization in financial management functions in the Federal Government (H. Rept. 2512). p. 15232
The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11908, to repeal Sec. 1505 of the Social Security Act so that in determining eligibility of Federal employees for unemployment compensation their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws (H. Rept. 2515). p. 15232
10. **INSPECTION SERVICES.** The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 3873, to permit the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies without reimbursement or transfer of funds (H. Rept. 2508). p. 15231
11. **FORESTRY.** The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12242, to authorize the sale or exchange of certain Forest Service lands in Pima County, Ariz. (H. Rept. 2523). p. 15232
12. **RECLAMATION.** The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported H. R. 12899, to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, Calif.; and H. J. Res. 585, to authorize studies and a report on service to certain California counties from the Central Valley project. p. D814
13. **ELECTRIFICATION.** The Rules Committee adopted a motion to reconsider previous action of having tabled hearing to consider the granting of a rule on S. 1869, to authorize the TVA to issue and sell bonds to assist in the financing of its power programs. p. D814

House engrossed bill, strike out "for" and insert in lieu thereof "from."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, it is my understanding that this is really a typographical error and this bill is being returned to the House for correction as, for instance, the words "project purposes" were used instead of "public purposes" and the word "for" instead of "may", is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. This is merely to correct the typographical errors changing the word "for" to "may" and so on.

The bill, H. R. 13209, provides for the reconveyance of lands in the vicinity of Albeni Falls Reservoir, Idaho, to former owners under certain conditions and with certain restrictions. The bill was originally introduced in the Senate—S. 1003—and passed. It was referred to the House Committee on Public Works and the committee voted to revise the bill to provide that lands should not be reconveyed if they were to be used for public purposes. The Senate-approved version had used the term "project purposes" instead of "public purposes."

In making this change the committee voted to drop in a clean bill rather than to revise the Senate bill. This clean bill was prepared by merely changing the term "project purposes" to "public purposes" and the remainder of the bill was copied exactly as it was.

In the original Senate version there was a typographical error on page 3, line 21. This typographical error was the use of the word "for" instead of "from." In defining the term "former owner" the bill stated that this meant owners for whom lands were acquired, whereas it should have said owners from whom lands were acquired.

After the bill was passed and sent to the President this error was found, and the Bureau of the Budget, in securing comments from the Department of the Army on the enrolled enactment, learned that the Army considered that further study should be made to determine whether the bill could be administered because of the erroneous definition.

In view of the fact that there exists this question about the legality of the bill in its present form, the Bureau of the Budget suggested that the bill be recalled for the purpose of making this typographical correction. For this reason, I urge that the House concurrent resolution be adopted so that the error may be corrected.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING COMPENSATION TO CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11722) to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, and for other purposes, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 20, line 7, strike out "act" and insert "act, together with interest which would have been earned in accordance with law on such revenues had they been deposited in the trust funds of the tribe, as received."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this bill is about?

Mr. HALEY. This bill merely allows the Indians to collect moneys that have been due them from this project and also to collect interest thereon from the time the money accrued in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR DISTRIBUTION OF LAND AND ASSETS TO CERTAIN INDIAN RANCHERIAS AND RESERVATIONS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2824) to provide for the distribution of the land and assets of certain Indian rancherias and reservations in California, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, and insert "Alexander Valley, Auburn, Big Sandy, Big Valley, Blue Lake, Buena Vista, Cache Creek, Chicken Ranch, Chico, Cloverdale, Cold Springs, Elk Valley, Guldiville, Graton, Greenville, Hopland, Indian Ranch, Lytton, Mark West, Middletown, Montgomery Creek, Mooretown, Nevada City, North Fork, Paskenta, Picayune, Pinoleville, Potter Valley, Quartz Valley, Redding, Redwood Valley, Robinson, Rohnerville, Ruffeys, Scotts Valley, Smith River, Strawberry Valley, Table Bluff, Table Mountain, Upper Lake, Wilton."

Page 2, line 25, after "out." insert "It is the intention of Congress that such plan shall be completed not more than 3 years after it is approved."

Page 5, strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive, and insert:

"(b) For the purposes of this act, the assets of the Upper Lake Rancheria and the Robinson Rancheria shall include the 160-acre tract set aside as a wood reserve for the Upper Lake Indians by secretarial order dated February 15, 1907."

Page 5, after line 23, insert:

"(c) The Secretary of the Interior is

authorized to sell the 560 acres of land, more or less, which were withdrawn from entry, sale, or other disposition, and set aside for the Indians of Indian Ranch, Inyo County, Calif., by the act of March 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 162), and to distribute the proceeds of sale among the heirs of George Hanson."

Page 7, line 22, after "the" insert "dependent."

Page 8, line 18, strike out "\$110,100" and insert "\$509,235."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to get a short explanation from either the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] or the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] as to the purposes of this bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely provides a procedure whereby the Indians on a number of rancherias in California can terminate their relationship with the Federal Government. It does set forth certain things that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is to take care of prior to that termination procedure. The legislation is completely permissive and will be subject to a request from the members of the various rancherias.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The bill has had a thorough hearing before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. SISK. This bill did have a very thorough hearing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary situation on this bill and the approaching adjournment do not permit extended discussion or amendment of the measure. As one of the original sponsors of the legislation, I think it unfortunate that the other body has added a considerable number of rancherias not included in the bill passed by this House.

It has been my consistent policy as a member of the Indian affairs subcommittee to be guided by the expressed wishes of the Indians who would be affected by this and other legislation. When this bill was before our committee, amendments were added which were not acceptable to the Indians of a number of rancherias. At their request, I withdrew these rancherias from the legislation. While I do not have the power to override the will of this House and the other body, I want to make clear my belief that in this type of legislation, sound public policy should be coupled with the endorsement and request of those concerned.

While I am reluctant to see this bill enacted with its present content, it has the saving provision that it is purely permissive in character and cannot harm the people of those rancheries who do not want to accept the termination programs worked out for them. No termination plan will be prepared unless they request it, and no plan can be carried out without their final approval. In addition, the other body has added a section under which the legislation will expire in 3 years unless the rancheria Indians accept the proposed programs. I may add that I have the assurance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that no

pressure will be exerted on behalf of this termination plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOLARSHIP AND LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 675) providing for the consideration of H. R. 13247, a bill to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of education programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House reesolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 13247 to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of the defense education bill. The rule is open and provides for 2 hours of general debate on the bill.

I do not intend to attempt to explain the provisions of the bill, because later in the discussion under the rule I will yield adequate time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with this matter, to do that.

However, I would like to point out two things.

First, as I understand it, the bill was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor by an overwhelming vote, a vote of 23 to 2.

Second, and extremely significant, is a statement which I would like to read to you. It is a statement by the President on August 5 with regard to this subject.

The statement is as follows:

One of the major objectives of this congressional session should be short-term emergency legislation in education. In January, I recommended to the Congress a balanced 4-year Federal program in this field.

I have discussed with Secretary Fleming the bill recently approved by the House Education Committee, H. R. 13247. His statement relating to that bill released today is consistent with the views I expressed in a July 7 letter to Congressman WAINWRIGHT.

While the bill as reported by the committee fulfills most of the objectives outlined in my January recommendations, I believe, as does Secretary Fleming, that it should be amended to limit the number of scholarships and to make sure no tax dollars are paid to any scholarship winner who does not need those dollars to finance his college education.

At this point I would like to interrupt my reading of the statement of the President to point out that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], with the support of a majority of the full Committee on Education and Labor, proposes to offer amendments to meet the points just made in the President's statement. In other words, amendments offered by the committee will cut down the bill reported out by the committee to the size and proportion approved by the President, and will also provide for a needs test to the recipients of the scholarships.

I conclude, after that interpolation, reading the statement of the President:

I am encouraged by reports that the House will soon consider this legislation, and I hope the Congress will complete action on this matter promptly so the Federal Government may undertake this emergency short-term program without delay.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this overwhelming endorsement of the bill by the committee, and in view of its substantial and clear endorsement as modified by the President, I am sure this rule will be adopted by a substantial majority.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind there is not any doubt about the sincerity of the people who favor this bill. I speak of the National Educational Association. I speak of the many Parent-Teachers Associations throughout the country, as well as many educators. Nevertheless, I feel that I am compelled to make some observations in regard to it.

In my opinion, while those people who sponsor the bill are sincere, nevertheless I am wondering, when we bring forth a bill costing \$840 million for the basic 4-year period and an additional \$230 million during the next 3 years thereafter, or a total of \$1,070,000,000, whether or not we are not doing the children of this country a great disservice by presenting a bill of that amount, money that our government must borrow; money that our children and their children will be obliged to pay back during their entire lives. We start out with a measure presumed to be temporary, but the result in the case of this bill will be no different than the others, they start off being temporary but always become permanent. This bill calls for the expenditure of \$1 billion over a course of 7 years, but more than likely it will turn out to be just another one of

these programs that continues on forever.

You will note that this measure is called the Defense Education bill. Probably the reason for that was the belief in the minds of many people just after the first Russian sputnik was launched that more scientists, particularly, were needed to keep us abreast of the Russians. At that time many, many people wondered just what to do, and this is one of those things that in all sincerity they believed would provide the solution. I do agree with many people of this country that with the launching of the sputnik this country all of a sudden became illiterate. Ours is a Nation that has spent more money for education than any other nation in the history of the world. So I am not one of those who believe that this country which has spent billions of dollars for education became a backward nation with the launching of the sputnik.

Again I call attention to the title of the bill, "National Defense Education Act," and I want to speak of it from the angle of defense. We must bear in mind that maybe some have a feeling of worry in regard to the war angle that the Russians are away ahead of us in every field. We hear how each year the Russians give thousands and thousands more educational diplomas than we in the United States. As far as I am concerned the diplomas they speak of rather loosely may be nothing more than paper diplomas. I am not unmindful of the fact that they may be issuing a lot of these paper diplomas in Russia, but each year we are graduating thousands of young people from our colleges and universities who have really earned their diplomas.

I believe we should bear in mind also the fact that in this country in every factory throughout every congressional district in our communities, towns, villages, and cities, we have technicians and machinists who must be considered in the overall picture of education from the standpoint of the war angle.

Another educational feature we have in this country is the policy of our Defense Department which each year sends hundreds of officers and men to colleges and universities to learn electronics, physics, chemistry, foreign languages, and so forth. That is the type of education within the purview of this bill.

Then again we have certain private foundations that are providing scholarships to scores and scores of our young men and women, sending them to college to be trained in physics, chemistry, and the various sciences and languages. In Illinois, and I am sure it is true in other States, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of scholarships are given to outstanding students.

The bill says quite clearly that this does not prohibit the control of education by our Federal Government. However, we must remember, first of all, that the Federal Government is going to finance this program; they are going to pay for it. Now, I cannot conceive—at least, it has been my experience—that where the Federal Government finances a program they are not going to have some control over it. That is true of

everything in which the Federal Government has a stake; donations, requests, expenditures, or what-not. Then we must remember, too, that before the States can get this financing they must get the approval of the Federal commissioner, which this bill provides. The Federal commissioner will supervise all the activities under this bill. The purpose of this bill, according to its provisions, is to train students in science, mathematics, and foreign languages. Still, Mr. Speaker, the report states that the students will be completely free to select their own course of study and to choose their own college or university. Furthermore—and this is very important—the bill does not specify that those trained students must be available to serve their Government, industry, or anyone else, even though they do get this education under Government provisions. They are not compelled to serve the Government or industry or anyone else even for a limited time.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Would not the gentleman agree that one of the troubles we have to date is the fact that we have had educational theorists who some years ago started this progressive education? Heretofore the responsibility rested upon the educators of this country; it has rested upon the local communities, and we have insisted that they control education. The result of the past mistakes has been that so many of our young people are graduating from high school under this progressive theory where they get folk dancing instead of mathematics, history, or English, so when they graduate they do not know anything to speak of; they do not have the education they should have. That again comes back to the local administration, whether it be the local high school or college or whatever it may be. Would the gentleman claim that this bill is going to change that situation a particle?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say that our thoughts are identical, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Now, those who appeared before the Committee on Rules emphasized the fact that in certain areas of the world our people are not familiar with that foreign language; that this bill attempts to teach foreign languages. I will say to you: Even though we train these individuals in foreign languages under this bill, there is nothing in the bill that can compel them to go to Lebanon or any other territory or country on the face of the earth after they have learned that foreign language. The State Department employs a number of people. They could train those people to learn these foreign languages, and I think that would solve that question. Of course, they cannot compel anyone, after they give him this training, to go to any of these foreign countries.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the attention of the gentleman has been called to page 24, where there is a wide-open provision directing the Commissioner of Education to make loans to these States and to these institutions and that there is no limit on the amount of money that could be tied up in that way? All they have to do is to make a loan transaction, and they can go as high as they are of a mind to, \$15 billion, \$20 billion, \$100 billion, or anything else.

By turning over to the Commissioner of Education the power to do these things, the Congress—not just one committee of the Congress, but the Congress, both the House and the Senate—completely abdicate their jurisdiction over the appropriating of funds. And that is the way, in history, countries have lost their liberty.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the gentleman's question. We have an amendment that has been agreed to by the committee which I believe will take care of this problem. I would like to say that there is a built-in ceiling so that 20 percent of the total money appropriated is all that could be loaned to these institutions. In the amendment we take care of this and put it on an appropriations basis.

Mr. TABER. That would help.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman just made a comment about scholarships. According to the information I have, every year we have thousands upon thousands upon thousands of scholarships that go begging. The gentleman has also pointed out that there is no duty whatsoever upon any of these students to do anything in return for what they get.

This is called a defense measure. I might point out that just recently a mathematical wizard was found in the Army doing clerical work. That is just one example, and I can give dozens and hundreds of them, of men with 1 and 2 and 3 degrees, who are in the defense forces, who are not being used in the fields for which they have been trained, and those include science and mechanical and electrical engineering, and so forth. So the label "defense" falls short.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I say that I am opposed to this bill because first, as everyone knows, we just passed a bill the other day raising the debt ceiling \$13 billion. I take that into consideration when I oppose this bill. Secondly, the Department of Defense is preparing the enlisted men and the officers by teaching them science and electronics and radar, and so forth. That takes care of that angle of it.

Third. We have been very liberal in the Federal Government with local subdivisions where the responsibility lies to educate our people. We have provided liberal funds to local communities. In event this bill passes, it now carries an authorization for over \$1 billion, but I do not believe it is going to be a temporary measure because history shows that every time we start one of these programs, it continues forever.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Can the gentleman give us an estimate of the cost of this proposed legislation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. This bill itself provides for over a billion dollars; but when you start one of these programs which is supposed to be temporary, it turns out that it continues forever; so I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. GAVIN. How many students would be affected or is it proposed shall come under this legislation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I believe 23,000.

Mr. GAVIN. This is merely an entering wedge for a program that will continue over the years, is it not? What is the gentleman's opinion on that?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say that, once it gets started, it will go on permanently. Mr. Speaker, may I say in conclusion that the local communities have the responsibility for educating their people. States, such as the State of Illinois and other States, are taking care of that responsibility. Every State in this Union is better off financially to educate its people than is the Federal Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I would merely like to point out in response to what has been said that this bill certainly would affect far more than 23,000 people. If the gentleman is referring to the number of scholarships, we have by a bipartisan agreement reduced that to 10,000. That is the first point. But as a matter of fact this bill will affect every growing child and college student in the United States of America, and that is certainly many more than 23,000.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 12347 and shall detail the reasons for my opposition subsequently.

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me say that I believe I have not seen a more perfect example of the cart before the horse than we have here today in this proposed legislation. To

say that we have critical problems confronting us in the field of education and particularly in the field of public education in the secondary schools is true. To say that we have a critical need for more money in our public-school system and a near-tragic shortage of schoolteachers is true.

But to say that we can solve those deficiencies which are basic and fundamental by the passage of such legislation as we are proposing here today is to me actually a clear demonstration of hitching the cart before the horse.

The bill on its face purports to set up scholarships for boys and girls who are particularly inclined to study mathematics and sciences in colleges and go on to graduate study, perhaps, and become graduate mathematicians, engineers, and scientists.

How in the world are you going to support a program such as this when you know that the problem today lies not in the colleges but in the high schools, where in recent years we have had a lack of emphasis upon these very fundamental subjects? So the boys and girls to whom you are holding out these scholarships today are not going to be prepared until we prepare them at the high-school level to take on the sort of study the bill purports to emphasize.

Moreover, there are other reasons why this legislation is not the proper approach to our educational problem. The colleges today are bulging at the seams. During the 6 years I have been a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, college official after college official has appeared before this committee in support of Federal funds for school construction, saying that they had to have it in order to accommodate those who were applying for entrance into the colleges. Most of them are telling us that they have to turn these students away from their doors. Now to come here today and attempt to correct the problems of our education program by telling the colleges that we are going to give them more boys and more girls for the space they do not have, is an entirely wrong approach.

Let me refer to the hearings conducted before the Elliott subcommittee. And may I take this opportunity to express my feeling of deep admiration, affection, and respect for the gentleman from Alabama. I think there is no more conscientious Member in the Congress, and certainly no one more conscientious than he when it comes to solving our educational problems. He is dedicated to it. Nonetheless, you read the hearings before his committee and study the testimony offered by college representatives from all over the United States and you will find them saying almost universally that they do not think this is the proper approach to the problem.

Let me read to you, if I may, from correspondence coming to me from the president of my own State university down at Athens, Ga., Dr. O. C. Aderhold, written to me under date of March 31, 1958. He has this to say, in part:

In regard to scholarships from Federal funds, I made a brief statement in an article for the Atlanta Journal in January, pointing out that the subject is open to serious ques-

tion. I am enclosing a copy of this article along with supporting data from testimony by Dr. John T. Caldwell, president of the University of Arkansas, before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have marked passages in this material which reflect my position on the subject of Federal scholarships.

Turning to the article from the Atlanta Journal, which Dr. Aderhold prepared, I will read it only in part because time prohibits going into it fully, in the section on public scholarships in which he wrote for the Atlanta Journal, Dr. Aderhold says this:

Public scholarships or direct grants to students may become necessary; however, such an approach is fraught with dangers both to the individual and to our democratic society. Space does not permit a comprehensive evaluation of these several proposals.

I apologize for not being able to include in my remarks the entire article, but time will not permit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the statement of Dr. John T. Caldwell, president of the University of Arkansas, and also chairman of the legislative committee of the Land Grant Group and State Universities Association. Reading only in part from his testimony, he says:

Our reluctance to endorse a Federal scholarship program is based on the following factors:

(1) It would not meet the primary needs, which is direct aid to colleges and universities.

(2) The only justification for a Federal program, as we understand it, is to make college attendance possible for a substantial number of able students who cannot finance their own education. We question the extent to which a Federal program is needed to do this, and the extent to which it would accomplish its purpose.

I say to you Members of the House when we, as grown men and women chosen to represent the people of America, come here and let the launching of a sputnik or let the propaganda about achievements of the Russian people scare us into putting the Government into this program of public education, we are admitting that we are not doing what we are saying we are going to do in a democratic society. What we must do in our schools is to decide where we want to go; decide what our goals are; then develop and support a program that will carry us in that direction. We should fix our own standards and our own goals and not measure our standards or our goals by what Russia has done. We are not sponsoring a public education program to develop scientific robots in this country as Russia is doing, but we concentrate on a program of education to develop the humanities as well as the sciences and produce thereby a balanced society.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Georgia, [Mr. LANDRUM]. He has expressed with clarity and with conviction his objections to this legislation and those objections cannot be ignored and they cannot be taken lightly.

I know of no man in or out of Congress who is more devoted to the cause of education than my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM]. He has been very active in the Committee on Education and Labor and on the floor of the House on all matters which are truly in the interest of education, of public school systems, of schoolteachers and students who attend schools of America.

I have listened with interest to the comments of the gentleman, and I compliment him on presenting this information to the House of Representatives. The gentleman knows this subject, for his experience in the field of education did not begin with his election to Congress and assignment to the Committee on Education and Labor, because the gentleman served as a schoolteacher and a school administrator for a good many years. Those of us who know him and have known him for many years, know of his devotion to the cause of education and his desire and his accomplishments toward improving it in every way possible.

Mr. Speaker, the very title of this bill is misleading. It begins, "A bill to strengthen the national defense, and so forth," and after the citing of the title, there is little or nothing in the remainder of the bill which deals with the subject of national defense directly or indirectly. In this connection, during recent years it has become almost customary to attempt to justify almost anything by associating it with the national defense effort.

We are all interested in national defense. We are interested in strong national security to preserve those things and those principles which have made America great, but I, for one, am not willing to destroy America or to bankrupt it by encompassing everything on the face of the earth under the guise and nomenclature of national defense.

A great deal has been said in the debate thus far, and undoubtedly more will be said in the Committee of the Whole House if this rule is adopted, about the Russians and the Russian system of education and its accomplishments. As one Member of this body, I am not willing to admit for 1 minute that Russia and communism have surpassed America in one single thing. Their standard of living, their whole educational system, the products of that educational system, are so far inferior to those things which we have in America and the principles which have brought about those things and those pleasures which today we enjoy, that there is no comparison on either a qualitative or a quantitative basis.

Comments have been made about the great number of scientists that Russia is producing. It might be a great deal more accurate to say that they have turned out more human robots than America has; but the production of true scientific endeavor can be reflected only by accomplishments in fields of human progress and not in the one limited field of mechanical science upon which Russia has concentrated during recent years.

One thing which Russia would like to see us do, indeed which all the international Communist conspiracy would like to see us do, would be for America

to destroy itself by bringing about a financial instability and national bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House of Representatives voted to increase the ceiling on the amount of the national debt by an additional \$8 billion. It is possible that by the very language of this bill, which completely bypasses the Appropriations Committee, that the passage of this bill alone might make mandatory as the first order of business next year the increasing of the ceiling on the national debt. I refer specifically to section 307 (b) (1) which provides:

For the purpose of financing loans to institutions under this section, the Commissioner shall issue notes, debentures, or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury.

And then it goes on further to provide the manner in which these funds shall be obtained.

On the same page, page 24 of the bill, section 307 (b) (2) authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase any obligations of the Commissioners issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction which proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended.

This adds to the public debt and creates obligations of the Treasury of the United States in an amount which is not limited by this or any other legislation. This could literally run into billions of dollars controlled only by the Commissioner of Education. If this bill is enacted and if this section remains unchanged, the Congress of the United States will underwrite the cost of this whatever that cost may be without a study or approval by the Appropriation Committee of the House of Representatives. Mr. Speaker, it is highly possible that this back door method of appropriating money is already responsible for as much as \$147 billion of the total national debt at the present time.

It has been clearly pointed out before that there are already more applications for admission to many colleges and universities than there are facilities available for such applicants. I have not been able to find any provision in this bill which gives any assurance whatsoever of strengthening the national defense or encouraging or assisting in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs, which is given as a stated purpose of this legislation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation because I do not believe that it is needed, that it is desirable or that it will serve any useful purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the bill which we have before us today, H. R. 13247, is presented to us as a new scholarship program under the disguise of national defense legislation. It seems to me that the sponsors of this legislation have failed in their report and in their consideration of this legislation to evaluate the vast amount of work being done in this field by the Federal Government at the present time. I hold in my hand a report of the National Science Foundation of Government-university relationships. I would like to quote from page 1 of that report; the opening paragraph which states:

In 1940 the Federal Government was spending in the neighborhood of \$15 million per year for scientific research and development activities at colleges and universities. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, Federal obligations for this purpose at institutions of higher education or in laboratories managed by them will approximate \$440 million.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, I am greatly disturbed over the fact that the committee report which we have before us today gives no recognition to the increased emphasis we have given our university and college programs during this session of Congress. In the budget bills already passed by both Houses of this Congress, Federal obligations for institutions of higher education or in laboratories managed by them will approximate over \$550 million during fiscal year 1959, as compared with the \$440 million figure for fiscal year 1958, as stated above.

Page 2 of the National Science Foundation Government-university relationships states:

In addition to the many-fold increase in the total dollar expenditure of Federal funds for research and development at colleges and universities, the period since 1940 has been marked by three major changes in the composition and nature of Federal support. First, instead of being limited in general to the agricultural sciences, Federal funds now go into every field of the natural sciences, with major emphasis on the physical sciences and engineering, but with the biological and medical sciences running fairly well up. Second, the period since 1940 has witnessed the innovation and expansion of research centers—federally owned and financed facilities, or other research undertakings operated under contract. Third, in contrast to the relative absence of Federal extramural financial support of research facilities prior to World War II, a significant portion of Federal support presently goes for construction or operation of major research facilities.

Mr. Speaker, today more than two-thirds of the expenditures for all research

and development performed by colleges and universities comes from the Federal Government.

I would like to add that, in the present budget, the bills which we have passed thus far, we have added to the 1958 fiscal year budget figure over \$100 million, and the total amount available will be well over a half billion dollars in fiscal 1959.

Let us take a short look at the National Institute of Health budget and the National Science Foundation budget, which have already passed this House. In 1958 HEW budget for the National Institute of Health, we provided for research grants to the various universities and colleges in the amount of \$73 million. In the 1959 budget bill approved by this House, we increased that amount to \$102 million.

For fellowships in the National Institute of Health program, the amount provided in that bill for our colleges and universities in 1958 was \$6,200,000. In the fiscal year 1959, the amount for fellowships is \$10 million.

Look at the teaching grants in the National Institute of Health. In 1958 we provided for teaching grants \$32,900,000. In the budget bill that we passed this year we approved teaching grants \$49,900,000.

For construction costs at our universities and colleges, in 1958 in the National Institute of Health budget we had \$23,500,000. We have the same amount carried in the 1959 budget.

Let us look for a minute at the grants to colleges and universities for training purposes that were provided in the budget which was passed by the House and Senate for the National Science Foundation. In 1958 we provided \$30 million in this particular program. In the budget bill which we have passed this year, we increased that from \$30 million to \$102 million for our colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, I include several tables which set forth the increased emphasis this Congress has already given to science and research scholarships and fellowships at our colleges and universities.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
Comparison between fiscal 1958 and fiscal 1959

EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH GRANTS FOR AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES		
	1958	1959
Grants (research).....	\$73,000,000	\$102,000,000
Fellowships.....	6,200,000	10,000,000
Teaching grants.....	32,900,000	49,900,000
Construction research facilities.....	23,500,000	23,500,000
Total.....	135,600,000	185,400,000

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION		
Grants to colleges and universities (including training institutions).....	\$30,000,000	\$102,000,000

SUPPORT OF SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER BY NSF

Summary of obligations by activity and program

	Actual, fiscal year 1957	Estimate, fiscal year 1958	Estimate, fiscal year 1959	Increase (+) or decrease (-), 1959 over 1958
2(a). Grants and contracts:				
2(a)-1. Fellowship program.....	\$3,353,605	\$3,265,000	\$21,000,000	+\$17,735,000
2(a)-2. Institutes program.....	9,629,686	9,790,000	35,500,000	+25,710,000
2(a)-3. Special projects in science education program.....	688,185	655,000	15,400,000	+14,745,000
2(a)-4. Course content improvement program.....	629,840	611,341	6,000,000	+5,388,659
2(a)-5. International science education program.....	0	0	1,000,000	+1,000,000
2(a)-6. Clearinghouse for scientific manpower information.....	279,465	248,390	830,000	+581,610
2(a)-7. President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers.....	117,517	235,146	0	-235,146
Subtotal, grants and contracts.....	14,698,298	14,804,877	79,730,000	+64,925,123
2(b). Program development, operation, and evaluation:				
Personal services.....	56 352,017	64 442,000	137 864,605	+73 +422,605
Travel.....	26,597	32,200	67,000	+34,800
Other costs.....	222,874	232,463	1,208,395	+975,932
Subtotal, program development, operation, and evaluation.....	601,488	706,663	2,140,000	+1,433,337
Total.....	15,299,786	15,511,540	81,870,000	+66,338,460

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR TRAINING OF SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER BY NSF

Summary of obligations by activity and program

	Actual, fiscal year 1957		Estimate, fiscal year 1958		Estimate, fiscal year 1959		Increase (+) or decrease (-), 1959 over 1958	
	Number of fellow- ships	Amount	Number of fellow- ships	Amount	Number of fellow- ships	Amount	Number of fellow- ships	Amount
2(a)-1. Fellowship program:								
2(a)-1A. Predoctoral.....	772	\$1,867,005	776	\$1,865,000	970	\$2,600,000	+194	+\$735,000
2(a)-1B. Postdoctoral, regular.....	84	423,928	100	500,000	200	1,000,000	+100	+500,000
2(a)-1C. Postdoctoral, senior.....	48	387,598	42	340,000	100	800,000	+58	+460,000
2(a)-1D. Science faculty.....	100	675,074	90	560,000	300	2,000,000	+210	+1,440,000
2(a)-1E. Summer fellowships for high school science and mathematics teachers.....	0	0	0	0	2,500	5,000,000	+2,500	+5,000,000
2(a)-1F. Summer study program for college teaching assistants.....	0	0	0	0	2,000	1,600,000	+2,000	+1,600,000
2(a)-1G. Preservice teacher training programs.....	0	0	0	0	800	3,000,000	+800	+3,000,000
2(a)-1H. Training grants.....	0	0	0	0	1,250	5,000,000	+1,250	+5,000,000
Subtotal.....	1,004	3,353,605	1,008	3,265,000	8,120	21,000,000	+7,112	+17,735,000
2(a)-2. Institutes program:								
2(a)-2A. Summer programs:								
2(a)-2A(1). Summer institutes for high-school teachers.....	1 91	4,938,453	1 103	4,900,000	320	19,750,000	+217	+14,850,000
2(a)-2A(2). Summer institutes for college teachers.....	5	278,048	5	290,000	36	2,000,000	+31	+1,710,000
2(a)-2A(3). Summer conferences for college teachers.....	0	0	0	0	20	250,000	+20	+250,000
2(a)-2A(4). Summer institutes for technical training school faculties.....	0	0	0	0	10	500,000	+10	+500,000
2(a)-2A(5). Summer institutes for elementary school supervisors.....	0	0	0	0	30	1,500,000	+30	+1,500,000
Subtotal.....	96	5,216,501	108	5,190,000	416	24,000,000	+308	+18,810,000
2(a)-2B. Academic year programs:								
2(a)-2B(1). Academic Year Institutes for high-school teachers.....	16	4,250,885	17	4,350,000	30	9,000,000	+13	+4,650,000
2(a)-2B(2). Inservice institutes for high-school teachers.....	21	162,300	30	250,000	200	1,500,000	+170	+1,250,000
2(a)-2B(3). Inservice institutes for elementary-school teachers.....	0	0	0	0	125	1,000,000	+125	+1,000,000
Subtotal.....	37	4,413,185	47	4,600,000	355	11,500,000	+308	+6,900,000
Subtotal.....	133	9,629,686	155	9,790,000	771	35,500,000	+616	+25,710,000
2(a)-3. Special projects in science education program:								
2(a)-3A. Student programs.....		461,560		475,000		11,500,000		+11,025,000
2(a)-3B. Teacher improvement programs.....		226,625		180,000		3,400,000		+3,220,000
2(a)-3C. Special field institutes.....		0		0		500,000		+500,000
Subtotal.....		688,185		655,000		15,400,000		+14,745,000
2(a)-4. Course content improvement programs:								
2(a)-4A. Course content studies and development.....		471,500		430,000		4,500,000		+4,070,000
2(a)-4B. Supplementary teaching aids.....		158,340		181,341		1,500,000		+1,318,659
Subtotal.....		629,840		611,341		6,000,000		+5,388,659
2(a)-5. International science education program.....		0		0		1,000,000		+1,000,000
2(a)-6. Clearinghouse for scientific manpower information:								
2(a)-6A. National register of scientific and technical personnel.....		207,878		130,000		380,000		+250,000
2(a)-6B. Scientific manpower studies.....		71,597		118,390		450,000		+331,610
Subtotal.....		279,465		248,390		830,000		+581,610
2(a)-7. President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers.....		117,517		235,146		0		-235,146
Total.....		14,698,298		14,804,877		79,730,000		+64,925,123

1 4 of these institutes also had college teacher participants.

Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission is also making available large grants to our colleges and universities. In fiscal year 1958 the AEC made available primarily to educational institutions \$64 million in the field of basic research. In the Atomic Energy Commission budget which we recently passed \$79 million is made available for fiscal year 1959, almost entirely to our educational institutions to encourage basic science and basic research. Below is a table listing individual graduate fellowship grants which have already been made available by this Congress in appropriation bills which we have passed.

Student fellowships	1958	1959
NIH.....	6,200,000	10,000,000
NIH (teaching grants).....	32,900,000	49,900,000
AEC.....	686,000	954,000
NSF.....	3,265,000	6,400,000

This table excludes the Department of Defense appropriation which was just finally acted upon 1 hour ago. It is interesting however to note that in the Defense Department appropriation bill which we passed today that \$355 million was made available for research. Of this amount \$41 million is in the field of basic research which as you know is performed largely by our colleges and universities. This, of course, is in addition to the applied research grants which are made available in the Defense Department budget to many of our colleges and universities throughout America.

In the HEW appropriation bill which I have in my hand and in addition to the educational and research grants which I have mentioned above, over \$50 million is made available for research and training grants in the following areas: Air pollution—research contracts, public health traineeships, professional nurse traineeships, land grant college grants, vocational education grants, educational research contracts, vocational rehabilitation traineeships.

In the whole area of research we are considerably increasing the amounts of money made available in the fiscal 1959 budget as compared with the 1958 budget.

Mr. Speaker, I have had considerable correspondence from people throughout Wisconsin requesting passage of legislation to allow tax credits for high school and college tuition payments. In view of the fact that we are making over \$550 million available to our colleges and universities during fiscal year 1959, it seems to me that before we go into new grant programs, it is much more important for us to move in the direction of educational tax incentives. In view of our public debt, certainly every Member of this Congress will have to admit that we cannot move in the direction of further Federal grants and tax incentives at the same time. I favor the enactment of an adequate educational loan program and educational tax incentive legislation but certainly cannot buy all three at the same time.

As one Member of Congress, I have done everything in my power to oppose deficit financing. My economy record

will match every Member of this body. I am distressed and disturbed, however, over the deficit financing binge a majority of the Members of this Congress have embarked upon during the almost 6 years that I have been a Member of this body. The table below graphically sets forth the mounting concern I have over deficit financing:

The public debt
(In billions)

	Beginning of fiscal year	
1. Actual increase, 5 fiscal years—		
Fiscal 1954 (July 1953).....	\$266.1	
Fiscal 1955 (July 1954).....	271.3	
Fiscal 1956 (July 1955).....	274.4	
Fiscal 1957 (July 1956).....	272.8	
Fiscal 1958 (July 1957).....	270.5	
Fiscal 1959 (July 1958).....	276.3	
Actual increase, 5 years (July 1953—July 1958).....		+ \$10.2
2. Estimated increase during fiscal year 1959 (from \$276.3 to \$283.6, tentative, subject to revision).....	\$283.6	+7.3
3. Total estimated increase, 6 years (tentative, subject to revision).....		+17.5

NOTE.—Statutory limit of \$275,000,000,000 raised as follows: For fiscal year 1955, by \$6,000,000,000; for fiscal year 1956, by \$6,000,000,000; for fiscal year 1957, by \$3,000,000,000; for fiscal year 1958, by \$5,000,000,000; for fiscal year 1959, by \$10,000,000,000 (permanently to \$285,000,000,000; for fiscal years 1959 and 1960, by \$3,000,000,000 (temporary).

So that there can be no misunderstanding of the figures in this chart, it is noteworthy that the total national debt figures shown above cannot be laid on the doorsteps of Republican administrations. A recent survey shows that the net total of deficits for the 40 years the Democrats were in office from President Buchanan through President Truman was \$261.7 billion. During the 62 years of terms to which Republican Presidents were elected, including fiscal year 1958, the net total of deficits in budgets controlled by Republican Presidents was only \$5 billion. The correlation between Democrat deficits during the past century and the huge national debt, now \$276.3 billion gross, seems overwhelmingly significant. Deficit financing whether it occurs under a Republican administration or under a Democrat administration is obnoxious to me as one Member of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, despite its high-sounding title, the legislation before us today is a hydra-headed monstrosity that in one fell swoop injects the Federal Government into nearly every phase of our educational system from the first grade to the graduate schools of our universities and colleges.

In addition—and for the first time to my knowledge—it sets up a certain class of our citizens and gives them—and only them permission to get personal loans from the United States Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is titled "National Defense Education Act of 1958." It is misnamed. Its real title should be "The Nationalization of Education Act of 1958," for that is what this measure does. This measure is not designed to correct whatever deficiencies there are in this Nation's educational program. This

bill is designed to open the door in future years to an ever-increasing Federal participation in, and control of, our local school systems.

Let us take this measure section by section.

First. We have Federal scholarships—10,000 of them per year. My State's share would be approximately 50 per year—50 plums, paid for by the sweat of the brow of our taxpayers—to be portioned out to a select few. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 27,000 young men and women now attending colleges and universities in my State alone. I submit the addition of 50 scholarships is not going to add to Utah's contribution to our national defense in the education field.

The principle of federally financed scholarships is bad. Is it fair to take the taxes of a wage earner, struggling to provide the bare necessities for his family, and spend this money so that another individual will be spared the task of working his way through college? That is what this law would do. It sets up the beginning of an intellectual elite. Who are we to say, how can we be sure, that our national defense will best be served by granting subsidies to science students? Had such a program been in effect during the early part of this century it would have not been available to the Wright brothers, to Edison, to Henry Ford. We cannot with justice subsidize students in one line of endeavor unless the same subsidy is available for all and no effort to justify this selectivity as a defense measure can stand up under close scrutiny.

Second. We put the Government in the loan business with this measure. This is not necessary. Millions of dollars in loan funds already available to students of our colleges and universities go unapplied for each year—a clear indication that no Federal help is needed in this field.

Title 4 of this measure is nothing more nor less than Federal aid for school construction expanded to encompass Federal aid for school equipment. We may agree on the merits of a temporary Federal school construction aid measure. I am sure, however, that even its sponsors must feel that such a program should not be authorized through this back door approach.

Each additional section of this bill puts the Federal Government into another and new phase of education. There is even a section on Federal aid for educational television. My State of Utah—a relatively poor State as tax resources go—already has set up and financed its own educational television program. If Utah can do it, so can all of the other States. They do not need the Federal Government's help.

This bill's entire emphasis is wrong. Reading its provisions, one would get the impression that the problem this Nation faces is that its bright children are being deprived of an education because they cannot afford it. We know that is not the case. Our Nation to a greater extent than any other nation in the world makes educational opportunity available

to all of its people. That is the greatest strength of our system. If there is weakness, it is that we do not demand enough of our students at all school levels. This is not one feature of this bill that would correct this, our major educational defect.

I am aware that this bill is modest in the amounts of money it authorizes. We are just taking a little step in this bill but its broad provisions, covering as they do virtually all phases of education, promises bigger Federal intervention to come. If 10,000 federally supported university students is good, would not 100,000 contribute 10 times as much to our national defense? There is no limit to how large this program can grow in the future.

Oh, I am well aware that this measure carries the label "temporary—emergency." This is no consolation. I have served in Congress 8 years. I find the emergency always continues and that "temporary" in the language of bureaucracy does not mean what Webster defines it as. There is nothing so permanent as a temporary Government agency. Nor is there anything more lingering than the emergency in which it was born.

If we approve this measure today, we must be prepared to see it return to us in future years—each year a bit bigger until it becomes the colossus that will crush the educational system as we know it today and which has made this Nation the intellectual leader of the world.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion in the last few days to appeal to the House to stop, look, and listen. I have told you of the \$6 billion worth of bills that are upstairs in the Rules Committee and on the day down here that will cause you, the first thing you do when you return in January, to again raise the debt ceiling which you raised day before yesterday. The only way to stop it is for you to defeat a few of these rules when they come down here on half-baked legislation, which is the kind of legislation you always get at the end of a session. If you do, we can fold this thing up and go home.

There are enough bills up in the Rules Committee and others waiting to come before the Rules Committee that are going to keep you here for an indefinite length of time; and do not let anybody tell you differently.

Let us take the bill you have before you today, a billion and some odd dollars further addition to the debt limit. I wonder why these bills come here in the shape in which they do come here. As soon as they get to the floor the defects in them are acknowledged and we get rumors how on the floor we are going to change this and change that. But when you undertake to write a complicated bill like this on the floor of the House you get into trouble. What you ought to do is to stop this thing. You ought to defeat this rule. Let the bill go back to the committee, and let them bring in the

kind of bill we ought to have, get it into the shape they ought to have brought it in, if they ever ought to have brought it in.

I think it has always been one of the fundamental principles believed in by every State in this Union that education matters were local affairs and should not be interfered with by the Federal Government. If there has ever been one principle we have stuck by up until these sorry days, that is it.

Let us see about this bill. In the first place, it is said to be a defense education bill. There is not a syllable in it or anything in it that will do anything for defense.

It is said we are going to educate scientists. There is nothing in this bill about educating scientists. They may study domestic economy if they want to. They do not have to study anything; there is nothing mandatory about it. Everybody admits that an amendment is necessary. It should have been put in before it got to the floor. Then there will be an amendment cutting down on scholarships. Why did they not do that in committee, if that is what was necessary? Why wait until we get it here on the floor of the House to do it?

We had some discussion here the other day about this back-door approach to the Treasury where they never go to the Appropriations Committee at all. There is a provision in this bill—the Members do not know it—we do not have a chance to go into these bills when they are brought up so hurriedly, to read all the bills that are rushed through in these days—but there is a provision in the bill about lending money to colleges in unlimited amounts. There is no limitation on it; the ceiling is off. Appropriate? Do we have any chance to appropriate that money? No. It is one of these debt transactions that is carried under one of the Liberty Loan Acts, or something. Anyway, that is the gimmick that is being used. We have taken it out of several bills this year and I introduced a resolution trying to change the rules so as to stop it. This gimmick is in this bill. You will find it on page 24, and there is not a particle of limitation in there on the amount.

Now, talk about billions. The bill will cost over a billion dollars on its face, but I do not know what this particular feature will cost, and there is not a thing in there that puts any limitation on it.

There is not a thing in that that ever permits Congress to control it by appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, if we have not lost all sense of responsibility it is about time we stopped, and the time to stop it is now, and the place to stop it is on this rule. If you stop it on this legislation maybe you will stop some other rules. I know the Rules Committee is being pressured, I know Members feel obligations to their leadership to vote out the kind of thing the leadership wants voted out. I also know that the leadership does not have the time to study these bills and does not know what is in them. Now, if we will stop voting for these rules then we are going to stop getting

some of this crazy legislation that always comes in at the end of a session.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule. The provisions of H. R. 13247 are susceptible of interpretations that will involve the Federal Government in a field of local concern and insidiously preempt the authority and the obligation of States and local governments to control their educational systems.

The primary need today is more emphasis on basic education in our public schools. If we are failing to produce scientists, engineers, and advanced scholars, it is because we do not expose undergraduates to basic subjects necessary to understand or to lead them to pursue higher education.

Few high school graduates are properly prepared to receive and make a success of scholarships if they were awarded to them. Those who are and who are ambitious to further their education, can usually find personal or community aid or scholarships through industry and endowment funds which are becoming more numerous and more generous with time.

As has been stated before, the Federal Government, through its various agencies, is already providing thousands of scholarships to deserving individuals and largely supporting the major cost of basic research through scholarships. Local governments are becoming conscious of education's needs. Remarkable progress in facilities and teacher preparation is being made by local taxation. If left alone to work out educational needs, the people in the States will solve their problems without Federal intervention.

The Federal Government's sources of taxation continue to fail to meet present Government costs. This scheme, added to a virtually bankrupt Nation, can only lead to more legislation of similar type and in the end bequeath to posterity a financially derelict Nation where even the educated will become slaves in a socialistic society of sovietized citizenry.

I cannot support this bill.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)
STOP, LOOK, LISTEN, AND THINK BEFORE VOTING
TO DEFEAT THIS RULE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is true that legislation affecting so many of the people is often delayed until the end of the session. During the time that we were passing bills appropriating billions of dollars for different purposes, foreign aid, mutual security, the Export-Import Bank, loans to 59 countries, to the railroads, and for many other purposes, you did not hear a word about balancing the budget.

You did not hear a word about the national debt limit. But, near the end of the session, when bills involving small business, convalescent homes for

the aged, education, housing, and things like that are to be considered, you hear a lot being said about the national debt limit. Well, I want to say that we should stop, look, listen, and think before we defeat a rule providing for the consideration of a bill like this.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REPORT ON
SHORTAGE OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Basing its conclusion upon an extensive set of hearings held in the fall of 1955, the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, reported to the Congress that the most disturbing thing which had come to its attention during the hearings on Automation and Technological Change was the unanimous conclusion of experts that the United States was even then faced with a shortage of scientists, technicians, and skilled labor. The Russians, on the other hand, were rapidly forging ahead. The report on the 1955 hearings is short enough so that every Member of Congress might well have been interested in the dozen recommendations of the report. It is printed as Senate Report No. 1308 of the 84th Congress. Other distinguished Members of the House joining in the subcommittee report were the late Augustine B. Kelley of Pennsylvania and the Honorable Jesse P. Woltcott.

On January 21, this year, after the Nation had been suddenly awakened by sputnik to the woeful lags in our scientific educational program, I wrote to each Member of both Houses, enclosing a copy of this earlier report to the Congress, again calling attention to the committee findings.

I should like to put in the RECORD at this point the committee's finding on this particular problem of the inadequacy of the Nation's scientific base. It points out the danger that we take all our great deal of scientific knowledge for granted as inexhaustible or self-replenishing:

The most disturbing thing which came to the subcommittee's attention during the hearings was the near unanimous conclusion of the witnesses that the Nation is faced with a threatened shortage of scientists, technicians, and skilled labor. One may be willing to pass over lightly the expert testimony that there are plants in Western Europe that are "more highly automatic than anything we have got in this country" (hearings, p. 66), even in the automotive business. But we can certainly not dismiss lightly the generally accepted evidence that professional engineers are currently being graduated at a rate nearly twice as fast in Russia as in this country, and that technicians are currently being turned out at 30 or 40 times our rate. This evidence is not to be taken as necessarily indicating that our science and capacity for technological advancement have been surpassed elsewhere. It must, however, be taken as a plain warning that others can catch up with us and, indeed, at current rates, are doing so. The president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Dr. Vannevar Bush, summed up the problem for the subcommittee:

"We already have a shortage in this country of skilled men of various sorts. We also have a shortage of engineers and scientists. And not enough men are entering these fields. It has been brought out in these hearings that Russia is in some ways doing a better job in this regard than we are; they are certainly training more scientists and engineers" (hearings, p. 616).

It is, of course, generally accepted that the short-run retraining and salvaging of the skills of those whose livelihood is threatened by automatic machinery should be a first cost upon industry and the particular company itself. Technological change cannot be regarded as progress at all if it is not able to pay its own way, not merely in the junking of old machinery but by giving due recognition to the human costs of retraining and readjustment.

But the larger and longer run problem is that the Nation recognize the need for keeping up and advancing its resources in the form of trained experts in every field. The training problem exists at all levels. Dr. A. V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, in expressing grave concern over this situation said:

"I think that the critical area is the high-school level and it is primarily high-school teachers. I don't think we pay our high-school teachers enough, and I don't think we can get teachers who will inspire people to take up science and engineering as a career unless these people themselves are sold on it, and, with the great shortage we now have of scientists and engineers, it is difficult to get anyone with any competence to do the teaching in the high schools at the present time" (hearings, p. 587).

Under our traditional system of education, the first responsibility for this must fall upon the local communities and the individuals and business directly interested in specific kinds of skills and expertness. Many companies are already demonstrating their awareness of this problem by providing in-training technical courses and by endowing and supporting company fellowships and advanced education.

There are important reasons why this need for increased attention to the training of experts should be underscored and recognized as a real problem. The fact is that much of the knowledge and personnel upon which we are drawing so heavily today comes as a byproduct of the military background of the past decade. Under the necessity of war and defense expenditures, the Federal Government has contributed immeasurably to the building up of a comfortable present supply of trained personnel. This is all well and good, but none of us want a situation to arise in which we must depend upon war or defense expenditures as the means to securing such beneficial byproducts. Industry and the colleges themselves must take over and give adequate civilian support to technical education.

In many ways the question is not simply one of Federal support or no Federal support. It is a question of finding and accepting a peacetime program to take the place of in-service training of technicians, the war-accelerated and militarily sponsored college programs, and the later support and encouragement of education afforded by the so-called GI bill of rights.

Some 20 million persons now in civil life have been in the Armed Forces and a large part of these were given specific forced-draft training of some kind. A far larger number, by the use of or the sheer closeness and rubbing elbows with highly developed modern instruments, became familiar with technologies which, under other circumstances, would have been reserved for specialists. As Dr. Vannevar Bush pointed out to the subcommittee, there are in this country today thousands of young men to whom the design of what would once have been fabulous devices is not only possible but a pleasure. They can simply take off the workshop shelf a combination of cheap reliable gadgets with which they are already familiar and whose "queer ways" are already fully understood by them (hearings, p. 613).

This great pool of knowledge cannot be regarded as inexhaustible or self-replenishing. The dangers of its depletion deserve the

fullest attention of all in making sure that high school and college training are made possible for young people with demonstrated ability and aptitude so that the Nation and the economy as a whole can continue to profit by the fruits of knowledge.

"After the close of the hearings a report of the National Science Foundation entitled Soviet Professional Manpower, by Nicholas DeWitt, gave statistical substantiation to indications that in technical fields the number of Russian graduates currently exceeds those in the United States.

"The report concludes: We must bear in mind that during the last 2½ decades the Soviet Union has made enormous strides toward building up its specialized manpower resources. As a result of its efforts, it has reached a position of close equivalence with or even slight numerical supremacy over the United States as far as the supply of trained manpower in specialized professional fields is concerned. The Soviet effort continues. Our own policies in the field of education and in regard to specialized manpower resources will decide whether within the next decade or so the scales will be tipped off balance" (p. 257)."

In addition to the committee's own report to the Congress, I think a few very brief excerpts from the expert testimony at the committee's hearings speak eloquently of the need for strengthening our national defense by encouraging educational programs in the scientific and engineering fields. For example, Dr. Clelio Brunetti, director of engineering research and development of General Mills—himself a distinguished scientist—in his general statement on technology, prompted the following colloquy because of the startling nature of his statements—hearings, pages 368–369:

Now, our international picture: Although I am here as a representative of General Mills, I have another assignment as chairman of a working group of the Department of Defense on automation in electronic production. I feel it important to mention a point, again briefly, in our international picture.

We have our way of life. Other nations have theirs. If we cherish our way of life—and we do—we must be prepared to support strong leadership with a strong economy. I will mention just a couple of statistics, because I understand some of these have been mentioned before, but one of our world neighbors has made astonishing strides in the past decade or two. We are not particularly worried, but we must not be complacent.

In 1938 the Soviet machine-tool industry was producing 1,800 tools a year. In 1955 it may produce as many as 260,000 machine tools, 150 times as much. Now in the area of technical training where the long-range effects really will count, in 1956 we will graduate 27,000 engineers. The latest figures on U. S. S. R. are 50,000. We will train 50,000 technicians; the U. S. S. R., 1,600,000. Soviet aviation technicians have now been trained—

The CHAIRMAN. I wish you would go over that again. You mean to say that we will graduate 27,000 engineers next year and Soviet Russia will graduate 50,000 and we, will train only 50,000 technicians, and Russia will train 1,600,000?

Dr. BRUNETTI. Yes; these are the figures. You can find a description of them in Nation's Business for September 1953 and Aviation Week for March 1955 for the information that is available publicly. Another important point there, Mr. PATMAN, is the fact that training is going on in the military program. There is an intensive technological training of every military man.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean in Russia.

Dr. BRUNETTI. In Russia—this accounts for a larger growth. But, actually, no matter how this knowledge is gotten to the people, the fact remains that their technological strength is also increasing in that way.

Senator FLANDERS. You feel these statistics are approximately correct, or are they hearsay?

Dr. BRUNETTI. These are published figures as I quoted the Nation's Business for September 1953 and Aviation Week.

Senator FLANDERS. Where did Nation's Business get them?

Dr. BRUNETTI. I don't know their source, sir. My reasoning back of it, Senator, is the manner in which the training is going on, including the utilization of their military program for an intensive program of training, and in that respect, the figures seem to make sense, even though they may not be precise.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand Mr. Allen Dulles has similar figures, gathered through the Central Intelligence Agency. Since you mentioned the fact that Russia is training her men in the service, as engineers and technicians, and since you know something of the defense problems here in the United States of America, what do you think about our country doing the same thing? Should we consider doing more of it?

Dr. BRUNETTI. I believe we should. I believe we should be doing more, but I don't feel that I represent the Department of Defense and would like not to make any statements that would indicate that I was speaking for them, but as a citizen—

The CHAIRMAN. As a private citizen you think it should be done?

Dr. BRUNETTI. I think it should be done because it takes such a long time, for example, to train a fighter pilot or technician to keep an airplane going. Hence, it is important that we take advantage of that. At the same time, it would help to make the attractiveness of military training considerably greater to our people and then we have them prepared in two ways, military-wise and technicalwise.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, then president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, spoke from that vantage point and his position as Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development during World War II, and a long and distinguished career in scientific development. He was very frank in telling the committee, at page 616:

We already have a shortage in this country of skilled men of various sorts. We also have a shortage of engineers and scientists. And not enough men are entering these fields. It has been brought out in these hearings that Russia is in some ways doing a better job in this regard than we are; they are certainly training more scientists and engineers. And, from the discussions I have had with Dr. Homer Dodge, who has recently been in Russia, I believe their teaching is especially well done.

In Russia, if they find a particularly bright youngster he enters on a long career of study to become a scientist or engineer. They give him periodic stiff examinations, and if he flunks them he is promptly put in the army. In this country, in spite of all our admirable systems of scholarships and the like, the bright youngster may have to pay most of his own way, and it may not be possible for him to do so. I do not advocate the Russian system by any means; there are lots of things wrong with it. But we need to correct 1 or 2 things ourselves. We should make it possible for really outstanding youngsters, chaps of extraordinary talent, to proceed in education just as far as their talents will carry them. We should do this

because they will thus be able to serve society well. And we need to come to the realization that, when a young man is thus making real progress on a career which will enable him to serve his fellows well, he is doing his part, and we should not seriously interrupt his career for military training. Please do not misunderstand me, I recognize the need of military training, and I believe it is a good thing for youth when well conducted. But I also believe we have not yet solved the problem of the highly talented youngsters among us.

One further point of interest to the present discussion is that in which Dr. Bush pointed out the wide variety of needs in this field. Dr. Bush was asked specifically about types of scientists which we needed:

Mr. MOORE. Dr. Bush, we have tended to use these words "engineers" and "scientists" and "technicians" more or less interchangeably in this hearing and say we need more of them. This is no reflection on the need for engineers, but isn't it pure chemists or physicists that we need even more than engineers?

Dr. BUSH. I don't think it is a matter of more or less. We need all of them. Certainly in this country we have a tendency to apply things well, to be adept in applied science and engineering, and we are not similarly adept at science. Until recently we were far behind Europe in our support of basic science and in our production of basic scientific results. We derived a great deal of our basic science from Europe. Since the war we have been improving in this regard, until we are taking our place among nations as outstanding in many fields of basic science. We can't overdo this. We need more fundamental science. We need more appreciation of, and more support of, basic science.

The National Science Foundation has placed a great deal of emphasis on this point, and I think very usefully, and I think the trend has recently been in the direction of correcting our faults in this regard. But we need all kinds of pure and applied science. We need everything, all the way from pure mathematics, in the hands of the pure scientist, who cares nothing whatever about the applicability of his results, down or up, whichever way you may wish to regard it, to the applied scientist, and then to the engineer, whose task it is to apply science in an economic manner, and then, of course, through all the grades of technicians, and so forth.

This concern about the scarcity of trained engineers and scientists was voiced by industrialists and union representatives as well who appeared before the committee. Certainly any one who looks at the Sunday want ads in the metropolitan papers cannot help but be impressed by industry's problem of scientific recruitment. Mr. M. A. Hollengreen, president of the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, substantiated the statements of the educational experts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question of Russia being ahead of us in engineers and technicians, I think is an interesting question. It has been raised several times in these hearings. You have heard the statements made here, that while we will graduate 27,000 engineers next year, 1956, Russia will graduate 50,000, and while we will graduate 50,000 technicians, Russia will graduate 1,600,000. Would you like to comment on that?

Mr. HOLLENGREEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

I had a note here. I was going to ask permission to comment on Dr. Astin's statement.

I heartily agree with everything he said, and from my layman's and manufacturing point of view—and I happen to be a mechanical engineer, myself—I think the fact that we are falling way short in the development of engineers is almost as serious as anything else that this Nation is confronted with today. I think that the number of engineers we have in the future may well determine our future.

These references to 1955 evidence and the Joint Economic Committee report to Congress would not be important now, if we had in the meantime been aggressively trying to take care of the problem of scientific education. The fact is that we have not been. We have been going along our accustomed leisurely way, depending upon the colleges and universities to somehow dig up endowments and turn out a minimum batch of engineers, scientists, and technicians each year. It is not that the colleges have not been doing a splendid job. It is not that our engineering and scientific capabilities are not the best in the world. The important thing is that we not lose sight of the fact Russian scientists are also good. Russian universities, with the encouragement and active support of the Russian Government, are giving constant and effective attention to the fostering of scientists and scientific manpower all the way from the secondary schools to the graduate schools and the specialist's laboratory.

I will not extend this discussion except to point out that Dr. Detlev Bronk, former president of Johns Hopkins University, president, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council of Washington, when he was asked a year later for suggestions for helping solve the problems of our lagging educational program, pointed out the responsibility of Congress in helping meet the challenging need to support fundamental research. Dr. Bronk emphasized that this can be accomplished not only through the research and development agencies of the Government itself, but noted that in the field of education there should be more widespread public support of our private educational institutions. Pure science and basic scientific theory have played a tremendous role in the development of our country. This bill is one way of advancing that end.

I repeat, my friends, we cannot afford to be behind Russia in education. It is a great challenge to us. We must not fail to vote for this rule. We must not fail to pass this bill, because it is a long and proper step in the right direction, and I hope that the rule is adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is agreed by everyone, of course, that this bill needs amendment. But what I fear is that if

we do amend it and put it in proper form or in acceptable form here in the House, when it goes to conference it may be changed and come back as it was in the other body. That is the danger that I think we run into if this bill is considered and passed by the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Ought we not to defeat this rule and stop this crazy bill right where it is?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Unless we want to burn our fingers.

Mr. Speaker, it is always pleasant to listen to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Listening to him a few moments ago I just wondered why it is that we do not call top Russians over here to run our Government. We are always told how much further ahead of us Russia is, in every field and the progress they have made. If that is true, what is the use of fighting communism all the time? What is the use of spending our billions in an attempt to defeat it? Why not let their scientists and those others who have been educated up to the limit lay out our whole program? They are, according to those who have been attempting to frighten us into additional excessive and ruinous spending, doing pretty well. They are fooling us into spending ourselves into bankruptcy, and that as all know means disaster. The Texas gentleman [Mr. PATMAN] just told us they have more scientists, more people qualified for many necessary activities than have we—one group we do have—too many “spenders.”

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind my colleagues in the House that the gentleman from Michigan who is addressing the House at the present time was not present when this legislation was reported out of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. BAILEY. Somebody voted the gentleman's proxy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is correct. I have been on that committee since 1940. Recently you have been monkeying around with a lot of silly, foolish things all the time. Too many seem to think the real purpose of a Congress is to write new legislation—spend additional billions—regardless of the necessity, the purpose, or effect of such action. I do not propose to waste my time over there listening until the committee gets down to needed legislation. Everyone knows the need for remedial labor legislation. Today if anyone needs protection it is the employee—union and nonunion. The gentleman from West Virginia had better get some protection for his pottery and glass workers up there in his own district; that is what he is entitled to have. I have seen him change from a free-trade Democrat to a protectionist Republican. And maybe he will come around on this matter some day. He sure is a hard worker and an agreeable colleague.

Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to this situation, the rule should be defeated.

The gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, laid the facts on the line. If the Members read what he said a few days ago and read the statement put in the RECORD by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], they will learn and know we are going down the road to bankruptcy a situation desired by the Russians. We will have a depression that will really be one; and there is no question about that. Yet along comes a bill like this. And still there is more to follow.

I do not have the time to go into the provisions of the bill. I know its purpose—what will follow its enactment, Federal control of education, and with so many Communists in the Federal Government want none of it. I know who is over on the Labor Committee; fine gentlemen, like the gentleman from West Virginia and others up in New England; wonderful fellows, but apparently they have never earned a dollar by getting calluses on their hands. That is not a personal observation; it is a conclusion justified by the record of what they advocate.

My thinking is so parallel, follows along so closely, the argument and logic of the gentleman from Virginia Judge SMITH, there is nothing more that I need say. He has said it. He has told us what our spending will lead to and the only solution here, if we are not going to ruin ourselves, is to defeat this and other rules as they come out.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sorry. The gentleman has my admiration and respect—but it would be a waste of time. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this proposed legislation before us today. I trust that the rule will be voted down. I am again reiterating what I have said previously on these various Federal aid to education programs. I am opposed to the Federal Government's intervening in any part of our educational system.

Local responsibility and local self-government are keystones of the American way of life. Federal aid is always accompanied by a greater or lesser degree of Federal control. It is the opening wedge towards having directors in Washington to tell local school boards, superintendents, principals and teachers what they can do and what they can't do whether it is this program or any other Federal aid to education program.

I believe that citizens in every community should take a good, hard look at their local school systems. There are many problems to solve, and they can best be solved on local levels.

A large part of the problem we have today is one of self-discipline on the part of the Government and on the part of the American people themselves. The

Government within the executive branch must make a constant effort to curtail and eliminate nonessential expenditures. Special groups, rather than popular demand, are responsible for the push behind most Federal aid programs. The American people themselves must make an effort to curtail the constantly new and expanding demands upon the Federal Government for services, benefits and “free” money—for the people themselves must pay heavy taxes to the Federal Government before the Government can return part of it to the State, and the States return it to the counties and municipalities and for these various programs.

Once a program of Federal aid such as this is established, it almost invariably continues to grow and become more expensive.

To the outside groups which worked for its establishment and continue to support it, there is added another group within the Government. This is the group who administer the program—and who keep pressing for more money for it.

Each bureau within an agency is ambitious to build a little empire—with more employees to supervise, with higher salaries for the top men, with more money to spend, at the expense of the taxpayers. Larger and larger budgets result—such as the high spending programs proposed this year.

But the time has come when the American public is justifiably fed up with all Federal-aid programs, now realizing that we all pay the bill. In my opinion, we can secure better results for our schools under the supervision of municipalities and States rather than under the direction of the Federal Government.

The administration recently recommended that we look toward decentralization of Government—that we return to the States certain responsibilities. Here is one place we can make a good start—by rejecting this new proposal which we have before us today and let the States handle these educational programs. This rule should be voted down.

(Mr. HOLLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1956, before the launching of sputnik, in a speech I delivered before the House of Representatives, I said as follows:

The Western World is in a new grave kind of danger. The West has many times been threatened by military and political domination from the East. But never before has it faced the loss of its leadership in science and technology. Today, that leadership is in greatest jeopardy. In fact, it will most certainly be lost unless we find ways to meet the new dangerous challenge coming from Russia. Today's struggle is no mere military struggle limited to the fields of Europe or Asia Minor. This is a military political, economic, and technological race between the two giants in the entire world—United States and Russia. The key to that race is supremacy in scientific and technological manpower.

This statement was made by me in connection with a bill I introduced to correct weaknesses in our educational system.

These weaknesses I discovered in consulting with 149 engineering schools throughout the country. Every one of these schools pointed out that we were not developing the greatest resource that America has—the brains of its boys and girls. Much talk has been heard since 1956 over the school problems we face, but this is the first time the Congress of the United States has had an opportunity to correct the discrepancies and to meet the challenges of the creative world in which we now live.

In a democracy, we expect considerable debate before any drastic changes are made in our way of living. We are slow to meet and acknowledge that we are now having keen competition from the Soviet Union as we are a very proud people and believe in the system under which we live. But there comes a time when we must take stock of the direction in which we are going. The bill up for debate today is one that has made an inventory of our shortcomings and has come up with solutions in our educational system pointing out the ways we must take to again become the leader of the free nations in this automation age.

There is no substitute for brains and practical skills. Much remains to be done, but with the passing of this legislation great strides shall be made to regain our prestige.

In my conversations with the educators, they have been of one mind. We must avail ourselves of the best talent in our youth to see that those who have the ability to become scientists receive that opportunity—whether they be poor or rich.

In this bill, 10,000 scholarships shall be awarded to those who have the desire and the ability, but do not have the financial means to go to college and continue their education.

It also gives the opportunity to those who can pay part of their tuition by permitting them to secure loans.

One of the greatest blocks sustained in our educational system is the lack of numbers who after they receive their Bachelor of Science degrees do not continue to further their education and become doctors of science. This bill sets up a plan permitting such individuals to do graduate work and make great scientists. It recognizes the lack of proper teaching by encouraging those who are adapted as such to become professors in subjects that today lack experienced teachers.

Help is given to improve the laboratories in our schools and to carry out research work.

Unfortunately, in America we have neglected to recognize the great contribution made in the progress of our country by our teachers. We find that our colleges cannot keep their instructors as they are lured into industry and receive considerable more money than they do in school work.

I hate to use this as a comparison of the great respect the scientists and the professors receive in the Soviet Union. Today they are the honored class of the Communists and the best paid one. This is far from true in our country.

I intend to support this bill as I believe it contains and solves some of the problems—at least it is a start to gear the educational systems to this new era of outer space that we have entered. I realize it is hard for some to understand that we are at the crossroads. We must be realistic in our approach. It is the responsibility of government to fill in the great gap that exists between a realistic approach to the problem and our old system of education that has carried us this far. As one who has served over 20 years on the Committee of Education in the House and Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania we have always had to fight for progress against those who close their eyes and want to adhere to the good old days.

I sincerely hope this House shall respond to their responsibility to the coming generation, who—after all—are the ones who must meet the problems of outer space and a world in which science and automation shall decide their future in the years ahead.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people have been more concerned in the period of this past year with their educational system, and particularly with the quality of that educational system, than at any time certainly in my lifetime or during the period I have been able to observe it.

We started a year ago, Mr. Speaker, trying to figure out, as the law charges our committee with the responsibility of doing, and particularly the subcommittee of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman, what the duty and the responsibility of our Nation is as regards the challenges to our educational system in the time in which we live.

I do not know everything about this bill. I do not know everything about the American educational system. But I say this to you, and I want you to be convinced of this more than anything else, that we looked into this matter as fully as we could do in 1 year of time. We traveled across the country and held hearings, long hearings, in many different parts of our Nation. We heard 200 witnesses who came to us and testified about the various factors concerning the role of education in this tense period in which we live.

I know it has been demonstrated here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that one of the tendencies today on the part of the opponents of this bill will be to say, "You are trying to do what Russia is trying to do." But I say to you that that is not what we are driving at. I think we must take advantage of the facts that present themselves, and one of those facts is that the Russians today and for several years now have been producing twice as many scientists, lumping them all together, as has the United States of America, our own country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe those scientists areas good as ours—I hope they are not—but we do have evidence to believe they are pretty good. We in-

vited the leaders of the scientific world, the cream of the crop in our country, to appear before our committee, and almost all of them said that Russia was at least 2 years ahead of us today in the field of the exploration of space and the development of missiles for that purpose.

For a long time, Mr. Speaker, we said that the Russians had a very selective school system, that the Russians did not graduate many people from that selective school system, and that we with our wonderful educational system could surpass them. Everybody admits that our educational system is good. I hope it is the world's best, and I want to do what little I can as a Member of Congress to see that it continues to be the world's best. But, Mr. Speaker, the evidence before our committee was to the effect that the Russian schools are graduating each year, and did last year, 500,000 more high-school students than we graduated.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a fly-by-night scheme of a bill. It is a bill that we looked into and devised as best we could, after 45 or 50 Members of this House had introduced bills calling this matter to our attention, and urging action.

When we had gone into the matter as thoroughly as we were able to go into it, and we have not delayed on this bill and I would like to say this for the benefit of those who criticize us for being late with this bill—we have not tried to be late with this bill and we have not wanted to be late. It represents an enormous amount of hard work. We have worked on it nearly a year. We reported it out, I believe, about a month ago on the 2d or 3d day of July. Mr. Speaker, we found that in America today about one-half of the bright students of our Nation are not going on to college. That situation does not exist under the Russian system. We had evidence before our committee which, I think, is indisputable that the Russians are taking greater advantage today than America is of the brains and the latent abilities and developable talents of its young boys and girls. About one-half of our brightest youngsters are not going to college today.

Mr. Speaker, we have in America today fewer 18-year-old people than we had in 1930. In 1930, when our population was 132 million people, we had as many 18-year-olds as we have today when our population is 175 million. Mr. Speaker, these 18-year-olds are, in the relatively near future, when they are 40 or 45 years of age, going to enter into positions of leadership in our country. Our leaders then will come from these 18-year-olds of today.

If America is to take advantage of her great Godgiven resource represented by her youth, she must get herself in position to identify these brilliant youngsters.

The first thing we must know is who they are. The second thing we must do is to make our schools so good that they will have an opportunity to develop their latent talents to their fullest possible extent. The third thing, as I see it, is that we must hold up to those youngsters all across this broad land of ours the fact that there is an opportunity for them to

go to college. So we come to two of the main parts of this bill—the scholarship part that we have been talking about this afternoon and which two-thirds of the members of our committee have already agreed will be reduced by amendments to be offered on the floor of the House this afternoon or tomorrow to 10,000 scholarships, and that those scholarships will be absolutely on the basis of need and thus bring the bill completely, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] pointed out, in line with the suggestions with reference to scholarships made by the President of the United States.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. Is it not true that the chief objections to this bill have come with reference to the scholarship provision.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It has been the most discussed part of the bill, and there has been more opposition registered to it. But, I would like to say to the gentleman, there has been a great deal of approval of this bill. A great majority of the 200 witnesses who came before our committee approved it in principle and many, many of them approved it outright. I would like to say in answer to the gentleman at this point I hold in my hand a telegram from Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, president of the California Institute of Technology, who appeared before our committee. Here is what he says about this bill today:

The national defense education bill, H. R. 13247, is of great importance to the welfare and progress of higher education and to the training of future scientists, engineers, teachers, and other leaders. Urge your active support of this measure.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. Inasmuch as the committee is going to amend this and restrict it to those who cannot attend college on account of financial reasons, that takes away an opportunity for abuse of this scholarship provision and also most of the criticism of the bill?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It removes most of the items that have led to opposition.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to take this opportunity, if I may, because I was unable to get any time on my side, to point out that there was complete support in your subcommittee for this bill. As a matter of fact, your leadership in regard to this bill is a national contribution. I hope the membership will pay careful attention to your explanation of the bill. If you do not have time to explain it, it would seem to me a futile thing to defeat the rule on the bill, which certainly has not been explained by our side who have gotten up and said it was a bad bill but in no way have explained the bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. Today we voted nearly \$40 billion for defense. It has been said that this bill has no relationship to defense. Is there any relationship between our requirements in this field of education and what we do with this \$40 billion?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would say to the gentleman that I do not know of any way on earth in which we might set the stage to preserve, conserve, and save a part of that \$40 billion than to adopt this bill. And what I say is particularly true of the future when we have had time to begin to feel the beneficial results of this bill.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. As I understand from the gentleman's statement, the scholarships will be distributed on the basis of need.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to refer briefly to a paragraph in the report on page 9, dealing with paragraph 4. The report reads:

The sums appropriated to strengthen State supervision and leadership in these subjects and for the administration of the State plan will be allotted to the States on the basis of school-age population, but in no case will be less than \$20,000 for any State for any fiscal year.

That does not mean in this section distribution according to the need, does it? It is a general overall distribution, is that not right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is allotted as prescribed on page 29, beginning with line 7 which reads:

From the remainder of such sums, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age population of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State for any fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

Mrs. CHURCH. To speak of it this way, is it similar to the formula to be used in the Kelley bill, for distribution of funds to schools, on the basis of the needs of the schools?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It does not take need into account.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just like to state this as a parliamentary matter: The other day we had a bill when it was indicated that substantial changes would be made in Committee of the Whole. I am constrained to say, as I think I said before, it would lead to much better legislation if the committee would get the legislation in the shape they wanted it when they asked for a rule rather than to undertaken to write it on the floor of the House.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Let me answer the gentleman. I think the gentleman from

Indiana understands that we are trying very hard to make adjustments in this bill that are not difficult to understand. It is a lowering of the number of scholarships to 10,000, and placing them on the basis of need. I do not think that is a very difficult or confusing amendment.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to hear what you say about this question of need. Further on this question of need, who will determine that there is need or what the rule shall be?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The State scholarship commissions which select the persons who get the scholarships will determine the basis for financial need. That is not a new question. I may say to the gentleman that the State of New York, for instance, has a scholarship program based upon need. They seem to have worked out a formula that has met with general satisfaction.

We do not try to pin down the formula in our amendments as to just how the need factor will be handled. As is presently true in the bill, we leave this question to the States. I am confident they will handle it well.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Conceivably, then, we could have 48 different systems for setting up a need program; is that right?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 265, nays 108, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—265

Addonizio	Cederberg	Dwyer
Albert	Celler	Elliott
Allen, Calif.	Chamberlain	Engle
Andrews	Chelf	Farbsteln
Aspinall	Chenoweth	Fascell
Auchincloss	Church	Feighan
Avery	Clark	Fenton
Ayres	Coad	Flno
Bailey	Coffin	Flood
Baldwin	Coller	Fogarty
Barrett	Cooley	Forand
Bass, N. H.	Corbett	Ford
Bates	Coudert	Fountain
Becker	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Beckworth	Cretella	George
Bennett, Fla.	Cunningham	Glenn
Bennett, Mich.	Iowa	Granahan
Bentley	Curtin	Grant
Betts	Curtis, Mass.	Gray
Blatnik	Curtis, Mo.	Green, Oreg.
Boggs	Dawson, Ill.	Green, Pa.
Boland	Delaney	Griffin
Bolling	Dellay	Griffiths
Bosch	Dent	Gubser
Boyle	Denton	Hagen
Breeding	Derounlan	Hale
Brooks, Tex.	Devereux	Harris
Broomfield	Diggs	Haskell
Brown, Ga.	Dingell	Hays, Ark.
Brown, Mo.	Dixon	Hays, Ohio
Broyhill	Dollinger	Healey
Byrd	Donohue	Heseltan
Byrne, Ill.	Dooley	Hoeven
Byrne, Pa.	Dorn, N. Y.	Hollifield
Canfield	Doyle	Holland
Carrigg	Durham	Holmes

Holt	Meader	Santangelo
Holtzman	Morrow	St. George
Horan	Metcalf	Saund
Hosmer	Miller, Calif.	Schenck
Huddleston	Mills	Schwengel
Hull	Mitchell	Scott, Pa.
Hyde	Montoya	Seely-Brown
Ikard	Moore	Selden
Jackson	Morano	Sheehan
Jarman	Morgan	Shelley
Jennings	Morrison	Sheppard
Johnson	Moulder	Sikes
Jones, Ala.	Multer	Siler
Judd	Natcher	Simpson, Ill.
Karsten	Nix	Sisk
Kean	Norblad	Smith, Miss.
Kearns	Norrell	Springer
Keating	O'Brien, Ill.	Staggers
Kee	O'Brien, N. Y.	Steed
Kelly, N. Y.	O'Hara, Ill.	Sullivan
Keogh	O'Konski	Talle
Kilday	Osmer	Teague, Calif.
Kilgore	Ostertag	Teller
King	Patman	Tewes
Kluczynski	Patterson	Thomas
Knox	Perkins	Thompson, N. J.
Knutson	Pfost	Thompson, Tex.
Lafore	Philbin	Thornberry
Lane	Poage	Tollefson
Lankford	Polk	Trimble
LeCompte	Porter	Udall
Lennon	Powell	Ullman
Libonati	Price	Vanik
McCarthy	Prouty	Van Zandt
McCormack	Quie	Wainwright
McDonough	Rabaut	Walter
McFall	Rains	Watts
McGovern	Rees, Kans.	Westland
McIntire	Reuss	Wharton
McIntosh	Rhodes, Ariz.	Widnall
McVey	Rhodes, Pa.	Wier
Macdonald	Riehlman	Wigglesworth
Machrowicz	Roberts	Williams, N. Y.
Mack, Ill.	Robison, N. Y.	Wilson, Calif.
Mack, Wash.	Robison, Ky.	Withrow
Madden	Rodino	Wolverton
Magnuson	Rogers, Colo.	Wright
Mahon	Rogers, Fla.	Yates
Maillard	Rogers, Mass.	Young
Marshall	Rooney	Younger
Martin	Roosevelt	Zablocki
Matthews	Rutherford	Zelenko
May	Sadlak	

NAYS—108

Abbitt	Gavin	Nimt
Abernethy	Gross	O'Hara, Minn.
Alexander	Gwinn	Passman
Alger	Haley	Pelly
Allen, Ill.	Halleck	Pilcher
Andersen,	Harden	Pillion
H. Carl	Hardy	Poff
Arends	Harrison, Nebr.	Ray
Ashmore	Harrison, Va.	Reed
Barden	Harvey	Riley
Beamer	Hemphill	Rivers
Berry	Henderson	Rogers, Tex.
Bolton	Herlong	Saylor
Bonner	Hess	Scherer
Bow	Hiestand	Scott, N. C.
Bray	Hill	Scrivner
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Scudder
Brownson	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Budge	Johansen	Smith, Calif.
Burleson	Jonas	Smith, Va.
Bush	Kirwan	Stauffer
Byrnes, Wis.	Kitchin	Taber
Cannon	Krueger	Taylor
Clevenger	Laird	Thompson, La.
Cunningham,	Landrum	Thomson, Wyo.
Nebr.	Lipscomb	Tuck
Dague	McCulloch	Utt
Davis, Ga.	McGregor	Van Pelt
Dawson, Utah	McMillan	Vinson
Dennison	Miller, Md.	Vorys
Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Nebr.	Vursell
Dowdy	Miller, N. Y.	Weaver
Fisher	Minshall	Whitener
Flynt	Mumma	Whitten
Forrester	Murray	Williams, Miss.
Gary	Neal	Willis
Gathings	Nicholson	

NOT VOTING—57

Adair	Boykin	Edmondson
Anderson,	Brooks, La.	Everett
Mont.	Buckley	Evins
Anfuso	Burdick	Fallon
Ashley	Carnahan	Frazier
Baker	Chipfield	Friedel
Baring	Christopher	Fulton
Bass, Tenn.	Colmer	Garmatz
Baumhart	Davis, Tenn.	Gordon
Belcher	Dies	Gregory
Bitch	Eberhart	Hébert

Hillings	Mason	Shuford
James	Michel	Sieminski
Jenkins	Morris	Smith, Kans.
Jones, Mo.	Moss	Spence
Kearney	O'Neill	Teague, Tex.
Kilburn	Preston	Wilson, Ind.
Latham	Radwan	Winstead
Lesinski	Reece, Tenn.	
Loser	Robeson, Va.	

So the resolution was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Eberhart with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Chipfield.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Spence with Mr. James.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Latham.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Michel.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of education programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 13247, with Mr. FOGARTY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I tried to make clear in the discussion on the rule, the scholarship title will, I feel certain, be amended so as to lower the number to 10,000 scholarships, and so as to place their awards wholly on the basis of need.

Now, I will proceed to title III.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. When the gentleman says it will be wholly on the basis of need—

Mr. ELLIOTT. And ability. Ability first, and then need.

Mr. JUDD. Then those who meet certain standards of ability, if they also demonstrate need, will receive the awards?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is exactly right about that.

The next title I want to discuss is the title on loans. I would like to say that our committee found in its examination that the proposal for a loan system to enable our college students to proceed

with their education met with great popularity among the people who testified for the bill. The loan provision provides that \$40 million be appropriated the first year and \$60 million for each of the 3 succeeding years, to be loaned through college loan funds to students who meet the qualifications of worthiness that are set forth in the bill.

We found that in the college process about 50 percent of the boys and girls who enter college drop out. We found that 50 percent of the brightest group never go to college to begin with, and of those who do go to college, another 50 percent drop out before they have finished.

Now, in the committee and in the debate on the floor, I have heard somebody say the colleges already have loan funds. It is true that they do have loan funds. I would like to say that I take the position that we should do everything possible not to disturb existing loan funds but rather to encourage them as much as possible. But the truth is that one-half of the colleges of America today have no loan funds whatsoever. Of the 1,860 or more colleges, one-half of them today have no loan system whatsoever.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Could the gentleman advise us as to the total number of scholars who will be affected by both the loan and the scholarships provisions? In other words, how many boys and girls do you expect will be able to benefit by both portions of this program?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman understands, of course, that it is very hard to tell except for title 2, the scholarship title. About 10,000 people will be affected by that. I would assume 40,000 or 50,000 will take the examination, but 10,000 would qualify if the bill is amended as we think it should be.

Then under the loan provision we provide that a loan in any 1 year cannot exceed \$1,000. Divide \$40 million by 1,000, then you might get a pretty workable figure. But then it is thought lots of students will need to borrow \$300 to \$500. It is \$40 million the first year and \$60 million the second. We hope this will prove a means of keeping boys and girls in college once they get in, keeping them there until they finish.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am concerned about the loan provision, loans which the Superintendent of Public Instruction may make for these students. Suppose a State has no legal machinery for doing that; how is the student to take advantage of such a loan?

Mr. ELLIOTT. We provide that loans under this title shall be made through the loan funds of the existing university or new colleges and universities.

Somebody said a while ago that it was an open end system. That is not true. We provide that insofar as the loans are concerned that the Government makes to the colleges there is a safety valve in that the colleges cannot be loaned more

than one quarter of the total amount of their loan program, whatever it is.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would point out to the gentleman from Nebraska that the objective here is for the Federal Government to avoid going through as many hands as possible, and to have the students deal directly with the person who knows him best, who would be the dean or administrator of the school; and he would be the person to make the loan.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On page 24 of the bill I find this language:

For the purpose of financing loans to institutions under this section, the Commissioner shall issue notes, debentures, or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury.

What Commissioner is referred to in that language?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The United States Commissioner of Education.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I know, but he has no authority in our State to do that. How does he get the power to do it?

Mr. ELLIOTT. He has no authority in the gentleman's State?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. None whatsoever. He is not permitted to do it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not know the answer to the gentleman's question, but I yield to a gentleman who has made a very great study of this loan provision, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL].

Mr. HASKELL. The Federal Government puts 80 percent into a trust fund and the institution puts up 20 percent. From this fund set aside the moneys are loaned to the students.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield further, if a State has no legal machinery for that procedure, how do you do it legally?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for yielding in order that I may point out to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska that the word "Commissioner" on page 24 of the bill does not refer to the State commissioner of education. It refers to the Commissioner of Education of the United States.

Under title 3 the State has nothing to do with the administration of the student-loan program. The relationship is between the Commissioner of Education and the college or university which establishes and administers a student-loan fund.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee was asked to estimate the number of students who would benefit under the loan title. As indicated in the report at page 8, if we assume an average loan of \$600, approximately 83,000 stu-

dents would benefit during the first year, and approximately 125,000 students would benefit during each of the next 3 years of the program.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the gentleman advise us how the loan will be repaid?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The loan will be repaid with 2-percent interest while the student is in school and with 4-percent interest 1 year after he finishes his college course. Then it will be repayable with interest at 4 percent over a period of 10 years, amortized on a monthly basis.

Now, some people say, speaking of these loan funds, that while they are all well and good, when they look into the loans that some of the colleges are making—and this is not critical of the colleges—many times that money is loaned for 3 months or 6 months or 9 months, and I do not know of anything that a student, a sophomore in college, needs less than a loan for 3 months.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I received today about a dozen telegrams from the teachers in my State. They said I should vote for this bill because it means a raise in salary. Is there anything in here about a raise in salary?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Somebody gave them pretty poor information, apparently, about that.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Well, I do not know about that.

Now, I want to pass on to the next title, which is the equipment title, and which I think is certainly one of the outstanding parts of the bill. The intention of this legislation, I will say to the chairman, is to beef up the opportunities for young men and women to study the hard subjects.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. I would like to ask my colleague, first of all, if the scholarships are only on the college level, or are they on the high-school level, too? Where do they begin?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They are on the college level.

Mr. RAINS. And are they only for scientific study and for languages, or does it cover a broader field?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They cover a broader field. But we do say this, that in awarding the scholarships the State commissions shall give a high priority to those who have good preparation or who have outstanding ability in the fields of science, modern foreign languages, and mathematics.

Mr. RAINS. Is there any danger that in this type of program the graduate of an average high school, we will say in Alabama, where the gentleman and I hail from, will not be able to qualify and that the scholarships would only go to those who have special training in private schools or military schools?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say to the gentleman we tried to avoid that kind of a situation, realizing that when the Maker of heaven and earth gave out the brains, He passed them around and gave some to the son of a rail splitter in Kentucky, and some to the sons of the rich, as well. He distributed them around generally. We attempted to write this bill to reach those brains where they were, and if these scholarships are awarded on the basis of ability, which is a perfectly measurable quality as well as achievement, then I will say to the gentleman that I think we will reach for these scholars and the brains to which he refers.

Mr. RAINS. Did this bill come out of the full Committee on Education and Labor by a bipartisan vote or not?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It did. This bill received a vote, if I recall, of 23 to 2.

Mr. RAINS. Is it primarily and in substance the bill which the President of the United States backs and supports?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes; the President says he supports this bill. He has issued a statement, I will say to the gentleman, just day before yesterday saying that if the two amendments which we think will be adopted here this afternoon or tomorrow are adopted, the bill meets the approval of his message on education which he sent to the House earlier this year.

Mr. RAINS. I want the RECORD to show that I commend my colleague from Alabama and his committee for what I think is a very good job.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is it not true that the scholarships are allocated to the several States so that the State of Alabama has a guaranteed number under the legislation?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct. The legislation, as it reads, apportions the scholarships in proportion to the number of people between the ages of 18 and 21, and whatever proportion of the population that State has will get that proportion of the scholarships.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Subsequently in the debate it will be explained the method by which the identification of those people in the small schools is provided for in the legislation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is there not a provision in this bill that gives the person who gets the scholarship the right to choose his own courses?

Mr. ELLIOTT. He does have that right when he wins a scholarship and

goes to college. He has the right to choose the course that he desires.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. As I understand it, these scholarships may only be given to persons who are pursuing the bachelor's degree; is that right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. If the purpose is to get more superior scientists or superior scholars in any field, is it not true that they generally become such only after doing graduate work? How are these people going to get their graduate work?

Mr. ELLIOTT. We have a title dealing with the expansion of graduate education, which I hope to discuss next, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate carefully and I should like to have the gentleman addressing us, or somebody, point to any provision in this bill, any sentence anywhere in the bill, to support the gentleman's statement that the people who will get these scholarships are going to take some of this beefed-up program. There is not anything in this bill from cover to cover that says that a student who comes under it has to follow the sciences, or any other subject. This is an open-end invitation to a scholarship with no requirement, once a student has qualified.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that that is his interpretation, but if he will let me continue here he will find, I believe, that he and I will come to the same conclusion as to the importance of the scientific approach that this bill makes.

Mr. SAYLOR. That still does not answer my question. I am asking the gentleman to show me where in this bill it does that, and if he can, I shall support it and so will a great many other Members.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I hope I can show it to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I am looking at page 9 of the bill, line 6, which section is headed "Duration of Scholarships."

The duration of a National Defense Scholarship awarded under this title—

and so forth. There is nothing in the bill that tells what a National Defense Scholarship is. It seems that ought to be provided in this kind of a bill. I do not know how many other such failures there are in the bill, but I am suspicious that there are many of them.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. On the preceding page, section 201 describes them and says that:

Scholarships awarded under this title shall be known as "national defense scholarships."

So the term is defined in the bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I refer the gentleman to section 201 of the bill for an answer to his question.

Now we go to title IV of the bill, equipment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he leaves the other subject?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman has answered the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], I do not get it. Where in this part of the bill is it indicated that the student is going to study these courses such as mathematics, science, languages, in which we are deficient?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer that question?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It might be pointed out that nowhere in the bill is there a requirement that the student must pursue a particular course. I might point out that the national merit scholarship winners, some 67 percent of them, study mathematics and the sciences, and there will be the normal gravitation to them, according to the demand.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The scientists who appeared before our committee said that, "If you will get us the bright students to go to college, you need not have any fear about their entering the scientific fields, a large proportion of them."

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] put their finger on a very important point.

There is no direction that, once the student graduates, he shall go into the field in which he has studied and specialized. How can you have that in a free society? In Russia they can take a student, train him, and then put him into a certain field of endeavor, but in our system we cannot do that. That is one of the problems you have in a democratic society.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. We do have such scholarships as that in our military academies, and we do require them to stay in that field and return to the Federal Government something for what the Federal Government has furnished to them.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. That is a military obligation. The same is true in our ROTC-type programs. But under a national education program we seek national, broad excellence for the American people. It seemed to us in the committee that it was wrong and, to use the phrase, un-American to regiment them.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it un-American, then, to send men to our military academies

and later require service from them?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. No, because there they dedicate their whole lives to a career in the national service.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Not necessarily. We require them to serve a certain number of years in repayment for the education they have received at the expense of the Federal Government.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. We, on the other hand, hope they will spend their lives in the service of the country. In this case they are equipped to give overall national excellence rather than perform a certain function.

Mr. DEVEREUX. You also hope that these people will spend the rest of their lives in pursuit of these studies they have acquired at national expense.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The Military Academy graduates do not have to pay back the cost of their education. We know that college graduates earn in their lifetime on an average \$100,000 more than those who are not college graduates, so that this will be paid back many, many times in the form of Federal taxes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It was the committee's feeling that the military was in a separate category for consideration.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I did not mean to interrupt the gentleman as often as I have, but is it not also true that a trained scientist, whether he works in industry, whether he works for the Government, or whether he goes into teaching, no matter what field he goes into, still contributes to the over-all defense effort?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Of course he does. The gentleman has put his finger on an important point.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. It seems to be very important that this matter be clarified in everyone's mind. One of the first points we have to keep in mind is that these scholarships do not pay for the entire education of the young man. It is quite apparent that if they are going to be educated at these institutions they are going to carry part of the load themselves, so there can be no compulsion, no discipline. If we select these bright young minds that might not otherwise go to college, and we turn them into Congressmen or diplomats or others who render service to the Nation in some other field, will the country be worse off for it? Of course it is quite obvious that even if we select people with a scientific bent probably a majority will not go into that field. Since many of us complain of that, I think this should be clearly understood.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Under the equipment provision there is \$60 million to be allotted to the States,

as we said here earlier, and matched by the States, to provide laboratory equipment for these States that are deficient in that regard. Our committee did a considerable amount of inspection of that particular need, and we found that one of the greatest needs of American education today is sufficient laboratory equipment so that these boys and girls can have an opportunity to learn the sciences and to learn mathematics and to learn modern foreign languages.

Another one of our titles is that to bring about, we hope, development and expansion in the study of languages. Another is the expansion of graduate study. Another is to beef up our counseling and guidance and testing in the schools of America today. Another is for research in the educational use of television.

But, I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, in view of the small amount of time we have for this debate and in view of the very fine preparation that members of the committee have made on these various titles, I am going to close now and yield to each of the Members in his specialty under the various titles of this bill.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to rise at this time to commend the gentleman from Alabama for the fine work he has done as the head of this subcommittee. This has been the hardest working subcommittee that we have had of the Committee on Education and Labor. We heard from educators and scientists from all over the country and other people such as the chairmen of boards, and so on, and we do have a problem in the United States. In fact, some of the testimony actually scared the members of the committee, the shortages that we have in many fields; and the members of the committee did the best job they could. There are amendments. We are going to try to offer some today. I want the gentleman to know that I generally support this legislation. It is generally a good bill. I hope very much it is enacted into law. Once again, I want to commend the gentleman for the work he has done in presenting this to the House and to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman most sincerely.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at the close of debate today.)

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to second the remark made by the gentleman from California [Mr. Holt]. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], chairman of this special subcommittee as well as the members of the subcommittee have done a remark-

able job. The problems with which we were faced and with which we are faced here today are extremely delicate. Religious problems must be recognized. Segregation problems must be recognized. These problems were tackled not only in subcommittee but before the full committee, and, remember, it has been pointed out here that this bill came out of the full committee by a vote of 23 to 2. These questions have been fully aired again before the Committee on Rules. They are being presented to you here today. I report these facts to show that this is not a bill that popped up at the last minute on the congressional agenda.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to three points. As one who in past years opposed the school construction bill, I would like to point out the essential and key difference between the bill that is before us today and the school construction bill. School construction, I believe, many of us believe, is one primarily of local responsibility. That responsibility belongs to the school districts. Scholarships, the matter of higher education is universal. It most certainly is a Federal question. I fail to understand the arguments presented by the opponents of this bill, those who spoke against it a few moments ago on the rule when they say that just because the Russians are ahead of us, America should do nothing. What extraordinary logic—what extraordinary logic. To stand in the well of the House of Representatives and say "Just because the Russians have three scientists to one of ours, we in the House of Representatives in the United States of America should do nothing about it."

Based on the vote on the rule I gather that the membership most fortunately rejected that contention.

On the question of segregation, having last year introduced an amendment which was known as the Powell amendment, I would like to say that I do not think such an amendment belongs in this bill, for this reason: This is not a school construction bill. It does not deal with the problem presented in the Supreme Court decision on segregation. It is not the type of problem with which we would be faced in building segregation schools in the South. This is a loan program, a scholarship program, a material-aid program for certain scientific equipment, much needed. Certainly language training is much needed.

Finally comes the key section on languages.

Just before I came down here today I called the State Department and asked how many Foreign Service officers we had in the Arabic countries. There we have approximately 170 Foreign Service officers. How many of those do you think speak Arabic? How many of our representatives in the Arabic-speaking world can speak the native tongue? Five. Five American representatives speak fluent Arabic. Ten percent have a working understanding of Arabic. The Russian comparison is approximately 300. Three hundred.

I know it was suggested that it is invincible to make any comparison, but if we are at war, whether a cold war or a

hot war, we ought to face the facts. Congressmen are or should not be ostriches. One of the key provisions in this bill is to provide language training to overcome the deficiency I have pointed out. Let us face up to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] has expired.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, when you look across the tent floor and on the opposite side see two nostrils between the floor and the edge of the tent, you know the camel is coming in.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is the camel's nose under the tent. Just a simple little measure. Just a harmless little bill, but it is the camel's nose, next will be the camel's head. Soon the camel will be in the tent stamping out more of the free enterprise system, more of the great educational programs that have made this the greatest land in all history because of this system of free enterprise, because of the system of education that has given everyone an opportunity who is willing to work for that opportunity.

Federal assistance to education, or probably more properly called Federal intervention in our system of education, has been vigorously advocated by certain groups who have been attempting to socialize our educational system, but thus far those who still believe in free enterprise, those who still believe in freedom of education, those who still have fought the socialized system of education, have been able to ward it off.

The history is clear in the minds of everyone. The first great proposal was Federal aid to education straight across the board. When it became apparent that the socializers could not sell that to the American people, they proposed a plan to spend a billion or two dollars a year to build classrooms, and they furnished the Nation with so-called facts and figures demonstrating that only through Federal assistance would the local communities be able to keep up with the increasing need for school construction.

When it became apparent that the local communities were meeting their own problems and their own responsibilities and doing it in the American way, the Federal help group began to slacken their propaganda campaign. Then along came sputnik.

Sputnik gave the Socialists a new grip on life. They immediately conceived this as a great propaganda megaphone to sell to the American people this serious, burning need for scientific education, for scientific scholarships, yes—for all kinds of scholarships for higher education.

This bill is a tuned-down version of some of the more expanded bills offered before this Congress, but as I indicated at the outset, this is not the ultimate goal. This is only the nostril. Next comes the camel's nose, his head, and next comes the camel.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if it is scholarships that we need, scholarships which will make it easier for the American youth to obtain higher education, or is it desire to obtain higher education that we need more of?

I will grant that we have made it more difficult in recent years of ambitious young men and women who are compelled to work their own way through school to attend college. Through our labor laws we have made it necessary in many of the States for a young man to join the union before he can get a job. We have made it necessary for the employer to deduct a sizable share of his salary for unemployment and old-age retirement. We have made it more difficult for employers to hire additional help during summer months because of our laws throwing such employers into different brackets in the event they hire additional help, but in spite of these laws, college enrollment has increased 1,352 percent between 1900 and 1957.

In 1930 about the time that I finished college, only 12 young people out of each 100 went to college. In 1957, 39 out of every 100 between the ages of 18 and 21 were going to college.

Mr. Chairman, there is no one who is more desirous of seeing every youth in America receive the greatest amount of high school and college education that is possible to provide than I. I served 4 years on the board of regents of education in the State of South Dakota, handling all of the institutions of higher learning. We have in our State a large number of scholarship programs established by individuals and groups of individuals. We have loan programs in each of our institutions to help boys and girls who need assistance through bad periods. We have in this country a large number of foundations established as tax-exempt organizations by virtue of their beneficial purpose. Ambitious young men and women who want an education can get it today without the need of grants from the Federal Government, without the need of the Federal Government going into this additional Federal grant-in-aid program.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to Federal aid to education, to Federal control and regulation of education, to socializing our system of education at any level, whether it be on the elementary, high school, or college level.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs—H. R. 13247—is one of the most meritorious and necessary pieces of legislation that has come before the Congress during this session. I commend most highly the Subcommittee on Education and Labor for the splendid work it has done in studying this important question and the drafting of this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to assist in the improvement and strengthening of our educational system at all levels and to encourage able students to continue their education beyond high school.

A primary objective of this bill is to strengthen our defense system by providing an increased number of students in scientific and technical activities that have become so necessary in this advanced age of scientific and technical advancement.

Furthermore, the bill recognizes that there are other elements in our world-

wide leadership that require intelligent and informed young men and women. As an illustration is the need for a study of languages so that we will not be lacking in our contacts with other national groups. I can well understand the importance of this because it has been my privilege to attend as a representative of the United States many international conferences and many visitations to the countries of the world in matters concerning the interests of our Nation. It has been astonishing to learn of the ability of these leaders of other nations to converse with us in our own language. Our Nation is terribly delinquent in this respect whenever it is necessary to talk with other nationals than our own. The use of interpreters is not always satisfactory.

In addition to this, I have been astounded in my two visits to Russia to realize the extent to which that nation is preparing its young men and women to meet the challenge of the present age. In this matter of language, for instance, there are thousands of teachers who are teaching English to many thousands of students. And, in the scientific field, it is frightening to realize that Russian colleges are turning out each year many more thousands of engineers, scientists and technicians than we are. The disparity in the number is unbelievable except to those who have made a careful study of the subject. It is time we awakened and made amends for our neglect in this respect.

I have noted by personal observation in Russia the vast program of education that is underway in that country. I have seen it extending from the kindergarten age to the college student. I shall never forget the scene of thousands of alert, energetic, and intelligent young men and women as they hurried from classroom to classroom in the University of Moscow. Twenty-three thousand students are gaining an education through this one college. And, throughout the land there are many more schools and colleges that are outstanding in the quality of their teachers and the instruction they are giving to the youth of Russia. It is time that America awakened to the necessity of meeting this challenge.

If time and opportunity permitted, I would like to have expanded my warning to America. This matter of education of Russian youths has lingered with me as one of the most lasting impressions that I brought back from my trips to Russia.

And, as a further illustration of what is being done in Russia under its plan to educate for the future, I learned that whenever a young man or a young woman showed particular brightness that person was immediately singled out and pushed along to the highest possible degree of attainment. Every such one is looked upon as an asset of the state and accordingly raised to a point of greatest possible usefulness to the State. And, when you couple with this the knowledge that recognition above the average is given in that country on the basis of accomplishment and usefulness to the state, it can be readily seen that there is a terrific incentive to these

young people to study and work in order that they may reach a higher social level.

I have mentioned the situation as I have seen it in Russia only that my colleagues might realize that what we seek to do in this bill is the American way to meet the challenge that has been laid down by Russia.

We have passed at this session of Congress an appropriation bill for defense of upward to \$40 billion. It is the largest ever passed in a time of peace. Why have we done it? The answer is plain. We have done it to meet the military threat of Russia and to make certain our security as a Nation. It is right that we should do so. It is equally right and necessary that we build up and strengthen the knowledge of our oncoming youth so that they may meet the requirements of the future. We cannot afford to be delinquent in this important matter. We owe it to the people of this Nation to recognize and to respond to the obligation that is upon us.

This bill is designed after careful study and consideration to accomplish the objectives of this educational program by, first, establishing a limited program of Federal scholarships; second, establishing loan programs for students at institutions of higher education; third, providing grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign-language instruction in public schools; fourth, establishing language institutes and area centers to expand and improve the teaching of languages; fifth, assisting in the expansion of graduate education; sixth, assisting in the improvement of guidance, counseling, and testing programs; seventh, providing for research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related mediums for educational purposes; and, eighth, improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

America is confronted with a serious and continuing challenge in many fields. The challenge—in science, industry, Government, military strength, international relations—stems from the forces of totalitarianism. The challenge, as well as our own goal of enlargement of life for each individual, requires the fullest possible development of the talents of our young people. American education, therefore, bears a grave responsibility in our times.

It is no exaggeration to say that America's progress in many fields of endeavor in the years ahead—in fact, the very survival of our free country—may depend in large part upon the education we provide for our young people now.

We are all aware that there are many bright young people in our midst who need financial help to meet the expenses of higher education. Many considerations arising from family conditions prevent them from attending college. The loss is not only to them, but it is also a loss to the Nation not to have the benefit of what they could mean in building a strong and intelligent America.

This bill provides ways and means that help can be extended. These provisions have been well prepared. They are con-

servative and sound. The purpose is good, and our duty is plain.

The bill deserves the approval of both Houses of Congress and the President. It is my understanding that the President has already committed himself to the bill with certain amendments that are generally agreed upon.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, to prevent any misunderstanding, I want to discuss one title of this bill, H. R. 13247, which I consider to be of vital importance to the successful operation of the scholarship provisions and those for strengthening science and mathematics in our schools. Title VII of the bill deals with the improvement of guidance services.

In making a national scholarship program effective, the early identification of the gifted students is essential. Early identification of talented students in the secondary schools enables teachers, students, and parents to plan courses of study that will challenge the talent of each student and assure that the student meets college-entrance requirements. Unless the work prior to entering college has been of the right kind, content, and quality, students cannot take full advantage of the opportunities of higher education.

Assisting the student in choosing the right field for his life's work is a prime objective of good guidance. The significance of this choice to the student himself and to the Nation contributes to the basic goals of the bill. The invigorating effect of having made a wise choice of a career adds purpose and persistence to his further education.

The benefits from testing, guidance, and counseling are not merely a matter of opinion. Scientifically conducted studies prove conclusively that students who have had the benefits of guidance services in high schools make better marks than those who have not had guidance from a trained counselor by more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. Furthermore, they enter college in larger numbers and receive college degrees in $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as many cases.

This title of H. R. 13247 provides for grants to the States to enable the State educational agency, in accordance with

a State plan, to establish, maintain, and improve programs of testing, counseling, and guidance in the secondary schools of the State. The Federal grants, allotted to the States on the basis of the relative school-age populations, will equal the full cost of the State's programs for the first year, and 50 percent of the cost of the programs for each of the three succeeding years. No State allotment will be less than \$20,000 for any fiscal year. Not in excess of 2 percent of the total appropriation will be reserved by the Commissioner of Education for the use of Territories and possessions for these purposes.

It is a well-known fact that we have in this Nation a serious loss of talent because many students who could benefit from further education drop out of school short of reaching their optimum level of achievement. Even more disturbing is the waste which occurs among the more able students. Approximately one-half of all high-ability students fail to complete a level of educational attainment commensurate with their abilities. It is also known that adequate testing, counseling, and guidance can make a significant contribution to the identification and educational development of all high school students, but particularly those in the more able category.

It is estimated that not more than one-half of the high-school students in the United States are provided with the services of a well-known counseling program. Contributing to this situation is a severe shortage of qualified guidance personnel. While there is a wide variation from school to school and from State to State in the distribution of counseling personnel employed, in the extent of counselor preparation, and in the number of students which each counselor must serve, altogether the Nation's schools now employ approximately 26,000 counselors, including both full-time and part-time personnel. However, in terms of full-time equivalence, there are only approximately 11,000. The best current estimates put the need at approximately 15,000 additional counselors in the public high schools alone, if these services are to be provided on an adequate basis.

A total of 41 States employ some personnel charged with counseling and guidance responsibilities. However, the State departments at this time generally are not staffed sufficiently to provide the professional leadership, consultative services, research, and publications which are required to promote the necessary expansion and improvement of guidance services in the local schools. The 41-State programs employ a total of only 63 persons, counting both full-time and part-time personnel, who are responsible for giving professional leadership for these services.

The program authorized by title VII of this bill is twofold. Appropriations of \$15 million are authorized for each of 4 succeeding fiscal years for grants to the States to enable the States to support their programs. The second phase of this program is the establishment of institutes. Institutions of higher educa-

tion with personnel for the training of testing, counseling, and guidance personnel will be invited to submit a plan for the operation of the institutes.

Taking geographical needs into account, those institutions best equipped and most proficient to perform the training mission will be selected. Enrollees for the institutes will be selected from persons employed or to be employed in full- or part-time guidance and counseling capacities in public-school systems. The selection and number of persons to attend each institute will be determined by the institution of higher education operating the institute.

FACTS RELATIVE TO TITLE VII

A 1957 Office of Education survey of State departments of education revealed that in two-thirds of the States inadequate staffs and insufficient funds at both the State and local levels were the greatest deterrents to providing adequate guidance services.

At the close of the 1957-58 school year there were about 22,330 counselors assigned time in our public high schools but 11,056 or about 50 percent were working less than half time as counselors; 6,290 or about 28 percent were working as full-time counselors. A full-time equivalent of about 12,800 counselors were available where at least 26,000 were needed for adequate staffing.

There is a wide variation in numbers of counselors from State to State. Over 51 percent of the counselors in the United States are in the seven States of California, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Illinois, which have 37.5 percent of the school-age population. There are on the other end of the scale 24 States which account for only 12.5 percent of the counselors but have 21.6 percent of the school-age population.

Approximately 40 percent—223 institutions—of the institutions of higher learning offering a graduate degree report having a curriculum for the preparation of guidance and student personnel workers. In 1957, 132 of these institutions graduated 1,878 students in this field. At the same time 106 of these institutions had 3,232 requests for placement.

Among the top 25 percent of our high school students as many as 1 in 5 do not graduate from high schools.

Out of each 100 high school graduates in the top 25 percent only 56 enter college.

Less than one-half of those who enter engineering schools graduate with a degree in engineering.

At the present only 4 out of 5 students in the top quarter of their class finish high school. Only 2 out of 5 in the top quarter go on to college. Many with high potential simply do not enroll in college preparatory programs. In order to recoup this loss of potential talent it is proposed that statewide testing start at the 8th or 9th grade level rather than 12th. This would help insure that the ablest students don't drop out of school and that they take the kind of courses necessary for college entrance.

In January 1958 there were 31 statewide testing programs representing the work of 24 State agencies in 17 States and two Territories. In 25 of these programs tests were available for grade 7 or higher. Twenty-eight State departments of education provide consultant and advisory testing services to public schools, eight provide scoring services, and 12 provide test materials. Twenty-two colleges and universities provide consultant and advisory services, 20 scoring services and 18 test materials.

By using test results in conjunction with previous school achievement it is possible to predict that those identified as the most able—upper 20 percent—will succeed in college in more than 9 out of 10 cases. It has also been shown that substantial predictions of college achievement can be made from ninth grade test results.

Students who have had the benefit of guidance services in high school make honor marks more often—27 to 10—enter college in larger numbers—53 to 36—and receive college degrees in two and a half times as many cases as those who have not had guidance from a trained counselor.

Students generally recognize the need for counseling. One survey of over 1,200 students revealed that only four indicated no need for counseling. In another study the students expressed the need for counseling and preferred counselors to parents and teachers for help with problems dealing with goals.

Arthur A. Hitchcock, executive secretary of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, stated:

Guidance is important in the schools, but its significance goes into the roots of this Nation.

In its recent statement of policy concerning the Nation's human resources problems, the American Personnel and Guidance Association endeavored to point out the significance of good guidance services to the basic values of this Nation in the statement that freedom of choice can "be enriched through the educational process, for persons can grow to the height of their potentialities when (1) they know of their potentialities, interest, and values; (2) they have the opportunity to develop them through education; (3) they know about the complex rapidly changing career picture; (4) they are motivated to develop their potentialities and to relate them to the opportunities in our society."

In placing the development of individuals in a democratic society in its setting of freedom to choose one's career, the statement reads:

"This generation has been called upon to make a decision that will shape the destinies of many future generations. At the heart of this decision lies one of this Nation's basic freedoms—freedom of choice."

The Rockefeller Report on Education, Special Studies Project Report V, Doubleday & Co., Inc., Garden City, New York, 1958, pages 29–30, read as follows:

Any educational system is, among other things, a great sorting out process. One of its most important goals is to identify and guide able students and to challenge each student to develop his capacities to the utmost.

There is overwhelming evidence of a determination on the part of the American people that the sorting out process be carried out mercifully and generously, rather than ruthlessly, rigidly, or mechanically. But it has sometimes seemed that rather than admit

differences in talent—or at least taking responsibility for assessing it—we prefer to accept mediocrity.

In recent months there has been much discussion of large-scale testing programs for the purpose of identifying talent. Used with a sound understanding of their strengths and limitations, present testing procedures can contribute significantly to a program of talent identification. When large numbers are involved, tests may uncover talent that would otherwise go unnoticed. And even when large numbers are not involved, a particular youngster's aptitude may be such as to defy easy diagnosis and may escape the attention of all but the keenest of teachers.

But testing procedures unwisely used can do harm. A few basic considerations with respect to them must be understood.

First, tests are most effective in measuring academic aptitude and achievement. There are certain other kinds of aptitude and achievement that they can measure, but with less assurance. And there are many kinds of talent that must go unmeasured because no adequate measuring instruments exist. In short, the tests are effective on a limited front. Decisions based on test scores must be made with the awareness of the imperfections in human behavior. We cannot measure the rare qualities of character that are a necessary ingredient of great performance. We cannot measure aspiration or purpose. We cannot measure courage, vitality, or determination.

Second, no single test should become a basis for important decisions. A series of scores obtained over the years enable teachers to achieve a reliable perspective on the young person's aptitudes, and minimizes the possibility of false diagnosis.

Third, test scores are one kind of data to be placed alongside other kinds of data. The test score is not to be worshiped as a datum so decisive that it alone can be used to settle an individual's fate; it is a highly useful addition to other data but should not replace them. Unfortunately, the most powerful influence making for excessive dependence on test scores is the willingness of adults to evade their responsibility for complex and difficult decisions concerning the child. The test score should be regarded as an aid in making—not a device for evading—such decisions.

The Rockefeller Report on Education, Special Studies Project Report V, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Doubleday & Co., Inc., Garden City, N. Y., 1958, page 30, read as follows:

The identification of talent (through testing procedures) is no more than the first step. It should be only part of a strong guidance program. The word guidance has a variety of meanings; we use it here to mean advice concerning the young person's educational problems and the most appropriate course of study for him. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that such guidance is essential to the success of our system. As many teachers as possible should be trained to take part in it. As many high schools as possible should have special guidance officers to supplement the teachers where greater technical knowledge is required.

The objective of all educational guidance should be to stimulate the individual to make the most of his potentialities. The fact that a substantial fraction of the top quarter of high school graduates fail to go on to college is a startling indictment of our guidance system. It is not surprising that teachers, trained as they are to deal protectively and helpfully toward young people, should focus a major portion of their guidance efforts on those who seem most in need of help, such as the retarded and the delinquents. But there are students at the high

end of the scale who present an equally great problem as far as their own self-fulfillment is concerned and an even greater problem as far as society is concerned. Within the framework of concern for all, guidance should give particular attention to able students.

The general academic capacity of students should be at least tentatively identified by the eighth grade as the result of repeated testings and classroom performance in the elementary grades. An adequate guidance system would insure that each student would then be exposed to the sort of program that will develop to the full the gifts which he possesses.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. As I understand, the title to which the gentleman refers actually has no necessary connection with the scholarship or loan program; in other words, the boys who participate in the program supposedly have already had their guidance and counseling. Am I right?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Those who have any guidance available to them now. Of course, this cannot affect the group of high school seniors for next year.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. That is what I am getting at.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is quite so.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In other words, what you are doing is trying to develop a program so that in our future years even more pupils will be ready and available to participate in the program.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We want them available at the earliest possible date. In answer to those who opposed the rule in the debate it might be pointed out that this bill is replete with help for high school students.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], raised a question which was not fully answered. The answer is simply that the experience with youngsters who have won national science scholarships and national merit scholarships is that better than 60 percent studied mathematics and science. So there is a natural gravitation to these fields.

Mr. Chairman, title VIII of H. R. 13247 provides for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of the communications mediums for educational purposes. It is a program designed to produce an overall attack on the problems of utilizing mass mediums in the educational process. First of all, it will provide an evaluation of what has already been accomplished through the efforts of the numerous public and private agencies which have pioneered this work. Second, it will identify the directions which seem most likely to prove fruitful in future study and experimentation. Third, and most important of all, it will produce scientific evidence as to the efficacy of utilizing mass mediums in education for the use of all those concerned with education—both professionally and as citizens—and for making plans for the further development of our educational system.

This provision of the bill, in the opinion of those who have given it careful study, would aid in making available to schools and those concerned with education for wide use the great wealth of modern teaching tools and materials which are being developed as our communications skills and techniques are progressing. We have need to harness these skills and techniques to utilize their potential for education.

We, as a people, believe that America's best hopes depend upon her human rather than natural resources and this is one of the reasons we are committed to universal education. To strengthen our human resources, to make the most of our greatest asset, the youth of America, we need the kind of educational experience that will increase the use of human intelligence. We need the fullest possible development of the capacity to think, to reflect, to weigh and judge, to make choices among alternatives and to foresee the results of these choices. We fully realize, however, that no matter how good the equipment and material is, it is the teacher who finally determines the quality of the learning experience, by his or her use of the teaching tools. It is necessary to make provision of equipment and materials and it is also essential through demonstration and teacher training to insure highest efficiency in using equipment and materials.

FACTS RELATIVE TO TITLE VIII

Amount of appropriation under title VIII, section 801—\$2 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

Number of educational television stations in the United States—33 now in operation, 7 building, 33 in planning stage.

First filmed course in physics has been used successfully in more than 400 schools, according to testimony of Maurice B. Mitchell, of Encyclopedia Britannica Films.

Total number of titles of films made expressly for classroom use at all grade levels is now 4,000—testimony of Maurice B. Mitchell before the Education and Labor Committee.

The Federal Communications Commission set aside 242 channels—now 255—for the exclusive use of noncommercial educational television—representing approximately 12 percent of all channels available for television use in the United States—in its report and order, dated April 14, 1952.

The following is a list of 70 cities which have educational television stations either in operation, building, or in planning: Houston, Lansing, Pittsburgh, Madison, San Francisco, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Lincoln, Seattle, Mumford, Ala., Chapel Hill, Birmingham, Boston, Champaign, Miami, Chicago, Detroit, Denver, Columbus, Oklahoma City, Monroe, La., Memphis, Andalusia, Ala., New Orleans, Philadelphia, Salt Lake City, Minneapolis, Atlanta, Milwaukee, San Juan, P. R., Oxford, Ohio, Athens, Ga., Corvallis, Oreg., Nashville, Dallas, Tulsa, San Antonio-Austin, Fayetteville, Ark., Jacksonville, Tampa-St. Petersburg, Albuquerque, Tucson, Ariz., Phoenix, Pullman, Wash., Toledo, Portland, Oreg.,

Dayton, Ohio, Little Rock, Ark., Denton, Tex., Durham, N. H., Vermillion, S. Dak., Orono, Maine, Grand Forks, N. Dak., Pueblo, Colo., Boseman, Mont., Duluth-Superior, Tallahassee, Missoula, Mont., State College, Miss., Charleston, S. C., Roswell, N. Mex., El Paso, Amarillo, Fort Collins, Colo., Brookings, Laramie, Wyo., Las Vegas, Nev., Savannah, Boise, Idaho, and Sacramento, Calif.

Educational television stations are noncommercial, nonprofit, and prohibited by Federal regulation from selling air time. They are locally owned and operated by educational institutions and organizations. These stations fall into three categories: (a) University stations, (b) community stations, and (c) State networks.

There are over 50 million people living in the coverage areas of the 33 existing educational television stations.

More than 100 institutions of higher education are now broadcasting non-credit courses over commercial stations throughout the country, and about 50 public, private, and parochial schools, county and State boards of education, and community educational television councils or groups are telecasting educational programs. Courses for credit have been telecast by more than 40 institutions of higher education over commercial stations. Today, about 2 dozen such institutions are conducting credit courses over noncommercial television stations. Educational stations alone this year are conducting almost 200 regular courses for high school or college credit.

At the elementary and secondary levels we find open circuit telecasting in almost every type of course: Arithmetic, English, reading, nature study, general science, physics, history, health, algebra, geometry, art, trigonometry, chemistry, spelling, music, modern languages, and driver education. Alabama, Nebraska, North Carolina, and Oklahoma are operating on a statewide basis, while important projects are underway in Atlanta, Boston, Cincinnati, Detroit, Milwaukee, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis.

Educational television closed-circuit operations on a limited basis are taking place in dozens of cities. The most comprehensive closed-circuit operation is in Washington County, Md., where a 5-year experimental project is underway involving over 12,000 pupils in 14 schools. Before the experiment is over, it will eventually cover all 48 of Washington County's public schools and their 18,000 pupils. The Fund for the Advancement of Education made the grant in support of the whole operation.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, I support and urge the passage of H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

I have long been concerned about the neglect of our manpower potential and on February 6, 1957, I introduced H. R. 4490, the Federal Scholarship Act. As I stated at the committee hearings, I believe this is one of our most pressing problems as a Nation, and I hope this legislation will become the law of the land before the Congress adjourns.

We have a great source of talent that is not going to be of any use to us unless we can train it to its fullest capacity. There are some 15 million Americans of college age in these United States. Of these, I might add that over 200 thousand of these young people are in my State—the State of New Jersey. In some cases, the families have incomes that can well provide for their college education. But, unfortunately, there are thousands of capable young people to whom the doors of higher learning will be shut because they do not have the financial means of getting a college education. Recently the College Entrance and Examination Board together with the National Science Foundation published a joint report that revealed this shocking fact—each year between 60,000 and 100,000 students of exceptional ability are prevented from entering college because of insufficient financial resources. Another survey shows that 7 out of 10 capable students cannot finish their college courses because of low family incomes.

What a tremendous loss. What a needless waste. It is hard to believe that a Nation as rich as ours, a Nation that extends financial assistance to the tune of billions of dollars to people of other lands must stand by and see its own youth so neglected. How long shall we be able to afford this extravagance in our manpower resources?

I need not take time to enumerate the shortages that exist in our vital professions, such as the shortage of scientists, mathematicians, physicists. This is only one phase of the tremendous lack of qualified personnel in many fields. I do not think that we should have a Federal system of student assistance merely to alleviate the shortages in science and technology alone, although at the moment this is a most pressing need. The shortages of teachers, at the elementary, secondary, and college level is as frightening as any other fact in our deficit of trained personnel. We must help the many thousands of capable young Americans to be educated for all the fields of endeavor for which they have been particularly endowed. We do not live in a static society and neither do we have a static population. America has as much need of the trained artist, the trained researcher, the trained statesman as she has of those who will maintain her defense, both on land, sea, and in outer space. But it will be impossible for us to fill all of these needs if we ignore the fact that financial need is limiting the opportunity of our youth, for the kind of education they deserve.

In July 1957 the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School presented its second report to the President. In this report, the committee listed those problems of higher education that were most urgently in need of action. The first of these problems was the shortage of teachers—what the committee termed as "the most critical bottleneck to the expansion and improvement of education in the United States." The second most outstanding problem in higher education named by the committee was financial assistance to col-

lege students. The committee's report gives an estimate of the actual amount of scholarship money that is available. In 1955 over \$55 million was available for scholarships: \$35 million through the colleges, \$10 million through corporations and foundations sending selected individuals to colleges and about \$10 million in various State programs. These figures included students studying on the G. I. bill. To these 1955 estimates can be added, the committee points out, the National Merit Scholarship program, increases in scholarship assistance by such States as New York, California and possible other States, and the natural growth in scholarship funds. Omitting Federal funds, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School estimates the available scholarship total at roughly \$60 million.

How real is this need for scholarships? I feel that the need for financial assistance to our college students is more acute now than it has ever been in the past. We are all familiar with the rising costs of living, and this rise too is as prevalent in the maintenance of our colleges and universities as it is in any phase of our lives. A recent study published by the United States Office of Education points out that the average cost of attending college for 1956-57 amounted to \$1,500 per year in public institutions and \$2,000 per year in private institutions. We are told also of the great number of scholarships that are available in colleges and universities. Industry has come forth also to help finance the college education of many of our most promising young people. But is this enough? Let us review briefly, for a moment the kind and amount of scholarships that are available to the prospective college student.

Again I should like to quote the second report of the Committee on Education Beyond the High School, for it goes on to say that according to a recent survey covering 147 representative public and private colleges during a period of 1950-54:

Nearly two-thirds of all scholarships paid less than 20 percent of the total college expenses of the scholarship holders.

In this survey, graduates reported a median total 4-year expenditure of \$5,020 of which only 6.4 percent, or \$420 came from scholarship funds.

Here we can see how inadequate present scholarships tend to be. In my own State of New Jersey, according to bulletins published by the United States Office of Education in 1957, 28 colleges and universities offered in 1955-56, a total of 4,515 undergraduate scholarships amounting to \$1,765,323 and 11 colleges and universities in 1955-56 offered 454 graduate fellowships amounting to \$598,918. For the undergraduate, the amount received was roughly under \$400 a year. When we consider the comparative cost of college which is estimated from \$1,500 to \$2,000 a year, for the undergraduate, we can see how difficult it is for a student to finance his college education. And these meager amounts are available only for those who have been fortunate enough to win

a scholarship. Thousands of others throughout our Nation are mentally capable but have not had the opportunity of even winning a college scholarship. The educational opportunities of our promising young people would be greatly enlarged by the programs established by this bill. The amount to be distributed to the States on the basis of each State's proportionate share of 18 to 21-year-old population will support an estimated 21,000 scholarships. The loan program, whereby a student may borrow a total of \$5,000, will enable many thousands of young people to get educations which, otherwise, they would be unable to finance. It is in the national interest that higher education should be available to all who can profit from it, regardless of economic status. The loan program will make it possible for deserving students to enter upon and complete a program of education at the higher level and thus afford the fullest utilization of our most precious resource—talented youth.

Similarly, the other important features of this legislation are designed to enable us to help improve American education at critical points. The very security of the Nation depends on the education and technical training of our manpower. We cannot maintain our position of leadership in the free world without more and better education. The Elliott bill will considerably strengthen our educational structure, and thereby help to fortify our future security and well-being.

(Mr. ASHLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 now before us because I am of the opinion that it will help meet two of the most critical problems facing our Nation today: the serious and growing shortage in the teaching and in the science professions.

Before the end of World War II and for more than a decade since its end school administrators, educators, and public spirited citizens have been complaining of the desperate shortage of teachers. That shortage has not diminished in the intervening years, but has grown and continued to grow. But convinced as we are of the need for correcting this shortage, no legislation has been passed to help meet the shortage.

Despite the fact that for some years our attention has been focused on the critical shortage of teachers, I doubt seriously if the real implications of this scarcity was felt until last fall when the dramatic launching of the Russian Sputniks awakened the American people to the imperative urgency of strengthening and encouraging American education in the fields of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. In the light of the current serious crisis in the Middle East the fundamental purpose and need for this legislation, it seems to me, is emphatically underscored. In my opinion, it is one of the most significant measures to come before the Congress this session, for its enactment will provide an urgent-

ly needed impetus to our Nation's educational program.

The fact that the scholarship programs which exist today in our institutions of higher learning are clearly inadequate to take care of the capable and talented student who needs financial aid in order to continue his education has been demonstrated beyond a doubt by studies of the United States Office of Education. The fact that thousands of our capable students each year do not continue their education beyond high school represents an entirely unnecessary and tragic waste of intellectual resources and potentially valuable manpower—a resource which never before in our Nation's history has been so vital to our security. Indeed, the loss of this talent today could well mean the difference between survival and destruction.

I believe that the Federal scholarship and student loan programs, as is envisaged in this bill, are necessary to insure that the academically talented continue their education and to provide new incentives to those students who have not even dared to consider college as within the realm of possibility.

While this measure stresses the need for meeting specific demands of the future by elevating the quantity as well as quality of talented individuals, it does not lose sight of the basic democratic principle of equality of educational opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, this measure represents our best hope for effective legislative action to advance American education and I earnestly hope this body will approve it forthwith. The hour is late. If we adjourn this session without a constructive Federal-aid-to-education proposal, we will have failed the American people.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL].

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act. I would like to call the special attention of the House to section 3 of this bill dealing with student loans, but before I do that I would like to clear up any misunderstanding by saying that if this bill is passed as it is expected to be amended it will be about \$125 million below the present budget of the President.

Let me say also that I believe presently as the result of sitting through these hearings that our educational system in this country is in some trouble. Second, I believe that the quantity and quality of the Soviet educational system is improving at a rapid rate; and, further, that if the people of the United States fail to meet this competition, 10 years from now it will be too late.

There is a definite belief, I am certain, on the part of every member of the subcommittee that the real job in education is to be done at the local level, and this is where we want to keep it.

In the matter of construction and the salaries of our teachers there is no question in anybody's mind that these things are important and affect both the quantity and quality of our teachers. If our local leadership fails to respond and

understand this we will not solve our educational program. We tried to figure how on a national level in a Federal bill we could come up with some help in the field of education, and I think under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Alabama the committee has done a very good job.

That there is a definite need for such a loan program as provided in this bill is borne out by a recent study undertaken by the United States Office of Education. According to that study, of the 1,746 colleges and universities which submitted information, 704 institutions, or 47.4 percent, lack loan resources.

The institutions of higher education which reported no available loan funds enrolled approximately 30 percent of the Nation's full-time college enrollment. But the primary fact is that almost all loan funds are inadequate to put a boy through college. The loan funds are limited in time, in interest rate, or in use; and what we are trying to do in this bill is to make it possible through a loan for a boy or girl to get a college education.

We think this is a very important thing not only as a method but in effect that the person has to have the motivation and the gumption to want to be willing to take a chance; that he is going to be able to pay back that loan and have the courage to take that responsibility. We think that is the American way and a good way to do it.

Mr. CRAMER. I want to congratulate the gentleman for his fine statement. I, too, introduced a bill in regard to scholarship loans. Could the gentleman, in explaining this section, explain further the thinking of the committee as to why both a loan section and a grant section are justified rather than just a loan section itself? I understand that it is partially because it is considered as an incentive, but does not the gentleman believe that a loan is an adequate incentive to a person who really wants to get an education and that they are the ones we really want to encourage?

Mr. HASKELL. I think that is true. I think the loan section, which is, of course, the larger portion of this bill as it will come out, will do the major part of the job in terms of straight merit and ability and then the need for scholarships. But, this is a matter of opinion. I cannot give you an answer except that those are the facts.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman also touch on the question of whether or not the amendments proposed by the committee would at all reduce the grant section of the bill?

Mr. HASKELL. Yes, it will cut it in two.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HASKELL. I would like to go on.

It has been argued that there is plenty of financial aid to college students available from private, State, and Federal sources. Let me point out that three-fourths of the 237,000 scholarships awarded by colleges and universities in 1955-56 were less than \$375. Nearly

two-thirds of all scholarships pay less than 20 percent of the total costs.

Some very learned gentlemen testified before the Education Committee on this provision in the bill. Dr. L. A. DuBridge, president of the California Institute of Technology, said in testimony:

There are quite a number of people who feel, and I share the feeling, that one should not go too far in making gifts to students but one should give students a feeling of responsibility that they are making an investment in their own future when they go on to a college or university. So I feel we should encourage students to borrow the money which they need to finance their own higher education because they and their families will profit from this experience in later years and will be able to return the investment that has been made.

Mr. Phillip Coombs, director and secretary of the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education, stated:

A loan program should aim to improve educational opportunities for any young person, not simply the ablest, who desires to go beyond high school and who is capable of gaining admission to a qualified institution of higher education. The main advantage of a Federal loan program is the possible liberality of its terms in contrast to commercial loans, and the abundance of loan funds that could be made available in contrast to those now available through the colleges.

Let me explain briefly what the loan fund does. The Federal Government is to put up 80 percent of the fund into what amounts to a trust fund and the institution would put up 20 percent into this fund, which is not to be commingled with the funds of the institution. This fund would be administered solely by the institution. When we had the people down from Harvard and Michigan and other institutions working on this bill over at HEW, the one thing that they all said should be done was that the institutions should administer the loan fund, because they are closer to the boy; they can watch him; they can aim the fund at the students that have the most ability and that can do the job. And, I think this is an extremely important section of the loan bill.

Now, after all that happens, you loan at the 2 percent interest rate while he is in college. This goes for the graduate student as well. As you know, this is the critical area. This 2 percent continues 1 year after the man leaves college. We loan up to \$1,000 a year with a maximum limitation of \$5,000. After he is out of college for 1 year the interest rate goes up to 4 percent. He can pay it off quicker or slower, but he can have 10 years to make that payment. I talked to Dr. Killian, Special Assistant to the President. A number of us went over there, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McINTOSH], and I. He had an experience at M. I. T. where they have been loaning since 1930 up to \$1,300 a year per student and he says that they lost less than 0.002 percent of the funds; that is, that which was not

repaid. The best guess we can get on repayment of these funds is that the worst loss would be around 3 or 4 percent. So the Federal Government, in the long pull, does not stand to lose a great deal of money under this loan program.

Another president of a great university said this. He said that they found that the students who had gone to the university on scholarships, as contrasted to those who had been fortunate enough to pay their own way, those who had gone to the university on the loan basis alone, had closer ties and a greater sense of responsibility as far as the university was concerned than any of the other groups.

So I plead with you and say that this is an excellent section of the bill. In terms of dollars, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Connecticut earlier, it is possible that if we take \$600 as the average loan, 83,000 students would benefit from the loan assistance in the first year and during the next 3 years 125,000 students would benefit under the program.

An excellent precedent for a program of Federal assistance to student loan funds has been established by the Federal Government's student war loan program, 1942 to 1944, which made significant contributions to the war effort by helping to supplement the Nation's vital manpower resources. The experience of loss was that it was very low. I think it was 4 percent, as I remember, of loans that were not repaid. But they graduated 4,187 engineers, 3,699 doctors, 1,040 dentists, 942 chemists, and others.

In any program of this type it is important that we realize the risk of loss to the Treasury that is involved in loans that are not repaid. In that area, let me say this. We have an amendment that I hope will meet the objections of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and others in respect to having what they call an open-end proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL] has expired.

(Mr. HASKELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, we have been more or less driven into this proposition of scholarships. We have been told by almost everybody—and how much they know about it I do not know; I do not know myself—but they have tried to make me believe that the Soviets, these Russians, are smarter than the boys and girls of the United States. You can believe it, if you want to, but not NICHOLSON. I think we are superior.

This is just another proposition of the Federal Government's stepping in to take charge of education. They have butted into about everything else that we do at home. This is one of the last ones—I hope.

How many here know how many scholarships we give out a year and who gives

them or the necessity for more of them? I tried on the committee to find out. I asked a great many questions about it, but up till now I have not had any answer.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. I just got this information about a moment ago. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is a total of over 32,000 students who are currently receiving education subsidies by the Department of Defense. This does not include the military academies. In other words, there are approximately 32,000 boys in the service who are going to college.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not see how the military academies enter into it as to their getting scholarships. The only scholarships I know about in connection with them is that they get appointed to West Point, Annapolis, or somewhere else if we recommended them, and then if they pass an examination they can get into those academies.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from Ohio no doubt refers to the Navy ROTC and the Army ROTC programs, where the students receive a certain stipend in exchange for which they serve in the Armed Forces for not less than 3 years following graduation, and then have an option of making the service their career.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, we need more space for the people we are now sending to college. Somebody mentioned the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the greatest institution there is in the United States or in the world, for that matter, as far as I am concerned. Perhaps the Soviets have something better than that. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology has to turn down about 33 percent of those who apply to enter it. I have been informed that my State University of Massachusetts has a long waiting list of boys and girls who cannot get in. Yet we are trying to raise the money here for scholarships, when if anybody wants to get a college education he can get it. I will bet you that half of the Members in this Chamber here who graduated from college had to go out and dig up a little money by working or through some other method, in order to work their way through college. We can still do it without being recipients of handouts from the Federal Government.

I think we should consider this pretty deeply and find out what the necessity for it is. Then if it is necessary, we can come here and do it.

The questions that were asked by the gentlemen from Nebraska, Ohio, and Pennsylvania were good questions. They were seeking to find something in the bill, yet the chairman could not find it in the bill. It was not there.

When we give a scholarship, that has nothing to do with Russia at all. The boy or girl who gets this scholarship can choose anything he wants to and can

choose whatever college he wants to go to. So it seems to me that this bill at this time is entirely unnecessary. We do not need it because we do not have the facilities to carry it out. Next year the Committee on Banking and Currency will come in here asking for more money to lend the colleges for construction of more facilities.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. A question was raised a moment ago as to the number of scholarships that were outstanding. I noticed this item appearing in one of today's newspapers:

There are literally thousands of scholarships which go begging every year. And the number of scholarships has been growing fast. The last survey indicated there were nearly 250,000.

That will give you some idea of the number of scholarships that have not been taken as of now. I thought the Committee should have this information for whatever it is worth.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. In that connection, may I say that that is true; but the average size of those scholarships is something like \$50. They run something like this: Anyone living on the Delaware River between Burlington and Beverley with the name of O'Toole, whose father works for the Belvedere division of the Pennsylvania Railroad, can get a scholarship. Certainly they have thousands of that kind; and that is an absurd example, if it is true.

Mr. AYRES. I think the gentleman is being a little facetious in his statement.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Just a little.

Mr. AYRES. The truth of the matter is that there are thousands of scholarships that have not been taken up.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to a bill which I introduced on July 29, H. R. 13582. This bill at the proper time will be offered as a substitute for the Elliott bill. There are no scholarships in H. R. 13582. It is a guaranteed education loan bill patterned after the GI housing loan program. The way it will work will be this way: If a student wants to go to a certain college, he applies to that college. He receives a certificate of admission and then he can go either to a private institution, a bank, or a corporation or anyone who wants to lend him money. He can borrow \$500 for each year that he is in school. I do not see the necessity for a Federal scholarship program. If a student is sincere about wanting to get an education and he has the intelligence to carry on college work, if he can borrow the money knowing that he is going to have to pay it back, it is not going to hurt him at all to have to do a little work along with the money that he re-

ceives. He will be able to borrow up to \$2,000 and pay it back within 10 years. In the event he does default, the lender does not lose. The Government guarantees the loan the same as we do in the housing bill. Also in H. R. 13582, there is a title II which authorizes an appropriation of \$10 million to the States based on the percentage of high-school students graduating the previous year that can be used for the employment of additional qualified teachers of science and to increase the rate of compensation of teacher of science in the secondary schools or to acquire laboratories and other special scientific equipment. Although there are many parts of the so-called Elliott bill that, perhaps, are good, I cannot see the necessity of authorizing an appropriation of nearly \$1 billion when just in the last few days we had to vote to increase the ceiling on our national debt limit. This makes it possible for the boy who does not have the money and does not have the financial means, but does have the ability, to go to college, if he wants to. The \$10 million appropriation is a small amount, of course, but at least it will let the Congress know whether or not the States are interested in increasing teachers' salaries in the field of science and whether or not they are interested in expanding their technical and laboratory equipment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman from New Jersey earlier referred to this National Merit Scholarship Foundation. I find a reference to that in the minority report on page 44. It says:

Neither of the bills proposes scholarship help to more than the top 3 percent of high-school students, and most of these students are eagerly sought by colleges and existing scholarship agencies. A large Federal program of, say, 40,000 scholarships would probably have as its major effect discouraging existing private and State efforts.

Was that information before your committee?

Mr. AYRES. Yes, that information was before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the Committee will see fit to read H. R. 13582 because we will vote on it tomorrow.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the debate on the bill and the discussion on the rule indicates that there is considerable difference of opinion about this bill. Obviously there will be some votes against this legislation, as well as a great many votes in favor of it. I think, however, that the problem has become somewhat clearer as a result of the discussion.

I would like to begin by saying I hope that we will not agree to accept the amendment, proposed by the gentleman from Ohio. Adoption of such an amendment would take from the program

which we are presenting a great many good provisions. It would set up provisions which were considered and rejected by the committee. The guaranteed loan program was considered by the committee and it was rejected in favor of the approach which we used in the loan provisions of this bill. In addition to that, as the gentleman from Ohio just stated, section 2 of his bill would provide assistance to teachers.

We decided against providing direct Federal aid to supplement teachers' salaries. We deliberately did not include that in our proposal.

Mr. GRIFFIN. With reference to the amendment which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] intends to offer, at first I strongly favored the guarantee approach to a loan program. The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL], my colleague from Michigan [Mr. McIntosh], and I have worked very closely and studied the possibilities of a guaranteed loan program. We have concluded that title III in the bill, as written, is better than any guarantee program which can be worked out—at least at this time.

I hope the Members will not fall for the Ayres amendment. It is a trap and would not work. The Ayres amendment would provide for a 60 percent Federal guarantee of loans made to students, with an interest rate of $4\frac{3}{4}$ percent. Veterans with a house to mortgage cannot borrow money at 5 percent under the GI bill. Obviously there would be no money available to students, through commercial channels, at $4\frac{3}{4}$ percent.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. There is plenty of money available at $4\frac{3}{4}$ percent. You know what happened in New York. You have corporations who are interested in getting these brilliant students into college, and they will be happy to loan them money on a guaranteed basis at $4\frac{3}{4}$ percent.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to begin my remarks by quoting an eminent proponent of the program. I should like to quote from the President of the United States in his special message to Congress last January:

Education best fulfills its high purpose when responsibility for education is kept close to the people it serves. * * *

Because of the national security interest in the quality and scope of our educational system in the years immediately ahead, however, the Federal Government must also undertake to play an emergency role. The administration is therefore recommending certain emergency Federal actions to encourage and assist greater effort in specific areas of national concern. These recommendations place principal emphasis on our national security requirements.

Our immediate national security aims—to continue to strengthen our Armed Forces and improve the weapons at their command—can be furthered only by the efforts of individuals whose training is already far advanced. But if we are to maintain our position of leadership, we must see to it that today's young people are prepared to contribute the maximum to our future progress.

We have had discussions, very intensive discussions, in our committee for months on the problem of how best to attack certain inadequacies which the President pointed out in his educational message. And I want to pay tribute to the crucially important role which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has played in the development of a sound bill. His good sense and objectivity, and his desire to develop a reasonable bill, have been an inspiration. Secretary Folsom, the retired head of Health, Education, and Welfare, and his staff also were of great value to us in arriving at what we consider a balanced and thoroughly defensible program.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would also like to take this opportunity to say that the gentleman ought to include himself in that regard. His contribution to this bill has made it one that is really workable.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The basic question we have been faced with is how can we improve the quality of our educational system. We recognize, of course, as the President has pointed out, that local responsibility is fundamental in improving our educational system. Yet we also feel that it is undesirable—because the inadequacies are serious—to take a do-nothing, stand-pat attitude on the part of the Federal Government. The Federal aid must be prudent but constructive.

We have suggested an attack on several fronts. Perhaps there has been undue public emphasis placed on the scholarship title. We are trying to identify our talented young people. We are trying to encourage able young people to go to college. If these institutions do not have adequate facilities to accommodate additional students, they can admit only those that they want. However, we are also trying, under several titles in this bill, to improve the teaching of our young people. We are trying to encourage more interest and emphasis on the so-called hard topics. We should like to encourage greater interest in mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages. We should like to deemphasize the easy courses which contribute to the deterioration of our educational system.

We are trying to provide some improvement in the scientific laboratory equipment in our high schools. We are trying also to improve the educational statistics, upon which we can make reasonable conclusions and recommendations for the improvement of the educational system.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. Would the gentleman like to elaborate further on why we think the States and the local districts themselves cannot handle these problems alone in this urgent need?

How many of the States have adequate scholarship programs?

How many of the States have stepped up their scientific laboratory equipment as we would like to see them improved?

How many of them have trained counselors who can select among the students those the Government can depend upon to make the needed contribution?

And then, here are some other things. I heard two interesting conversations over here just this afternoon on this question of why the States cannot take care of this entire problem. One gentleman came from a very important State. I asked: "How many school districts do you have in your State?" He answered: "We have 3,000."

"How many board members to a district?"

"About five."

"That would be 15,000 board members."

"How many teachers?"

"About 20,000 teachers."

That big State has nearly as many board members as teachers, and each one of these board members has his own views about what should be done about lengthening the school year, stiffening up the requirements, what subjects should be taught, what standards should be set, getting the right kind of teachers. With such a confused system as that how can we get a program that will make our school system progress to the point of being able to handle the school program envisioned by our President unless there is some kind of Federal leadership and encouragement?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments. He has pointed up the advisability of having the Federal Government participate in the solution of these programs. Obviously the Federal role must be limited. It must be carefully thought through to assure suitable action to meet these inadequacies in our educational system. If we fail to help, it appears evident that the problems will remain unsolved.

During debate on the rule there was some criticism of this bill because the National Science Foundation and the Public Health Service have markedly increased their research and training programs. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that these programs we are suggesting are with respect to general education. There is no overlapping or duplication of effort. Admittedly, the NSF and PHS programs do benefit directly thousands of individuals, and they carry out major educational undertakings. That does not mean, however, that there is no additional need for assistance. Indeed, it could be argued that existing Federal programs need to be supplemented so as to avoid an imbalance in certain specialized areas.

I refer again to the President's education message:

The programs of the National Science Foundation designed to foster science education were developed in cooperation with the scientific community under the guidance of the distinguished members of the National Science Board. They have come to be recognized by the educational and scientific communities as among the most significant contributions currently being made to the improvement of science education in the United States.

The administration has recommended a fivefold increase in appropriations for the scientific education activities of the National Science Foundation. These increased appropriations will enable the Foundation, through its various programs, to assist in laying a firmer base for the education of our future scientists.

There is, however—

And I am still quoting from the President's message—

an emergency and temporary need for certain additional Federal programs to strengthen general education and also for certain Federal programs to strengthen science education in our State and local school systems.

In other words the programs of the National Science Foundation are to be strengthened at the same time as our general educational system. Strengthening of one will not serve as a substitute for strengthening the other.

There has been considerable criticism of this bill on the basis of its cost. Much has been made of the fact that we have a substantial deficit, and it has been suggested that this education program therefore should be curtailed or defeated.

I am, of course, fully aware of the undesirability of deficits, the danger of unbalanced budgets. Nonetheless I question the wisdom of defeating a program of this character simply because it will cost something over \$200 million yearly. Surely expenditures in this field can have a direct bearing on our national security. Furthermore, this can be achieved at infinitely less cost than the \$40 billion we have just approved for the Military Establishment.

Perhaps a comparison with another program would be helpful. I should like to point out that under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 some \$1,400,000,000 has been spent since 1951. For the fiscal year 1959 alone, expenditures under Public Law 815 will come to \$60,150,000. Under Public Law 874 an additional \$149,500,000 will be spent in the current fiscal year. If such expenditures by the Federal Government can be justified, for relatively specialized programs, why should we consider as expendable the program under consideration? If there is a real public interest to be protected—and I am convinced there is—the fact that the program is new should not count against it.

Much more should be said. I regret that the time for debate is so limited. In my own opinion all parts of this program have merit. I believe the argument that there is a surplus of scholarships is basically a myth. About \$65 million is presently available to assist students each year. Of this total about 15 percent comes from endowments, 20 percent from current restricted income, and about 65 percent from general income of the institutions of learning. This compares to about 34 percent which in the year 1949–50 came from general income.

The increasing percentage of the revenues which institutions must devote to student aid means that less will be available for faculty facilities. It means also that our institutions of higher learning are today, in effect, the biggest donors to the young people who need aid. If ample scholarships were available, it ap-

pears hardly credible that they would divert their own badly needed revenues to these purposes.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, our President in a letter to Representative WAINRIGHT July 8 said:

The passage of a sound educational bill is a top priority objective of Congress and I heartily support your efforts to achieve this objective. If the United States is to maintain its position of leadership . . . we must see it that today's young people are prepared to contribute to the maximum.

I believe enactment of a 4-year emergency program recommended by the administration would have far reaching benefits to education and to national security in the years ahead.

The most important thing that Congress can do here and now is to stimulate a true revival of learning through the improvement of our school system. Senator FULBRIGHT says we are indebted to the Kremlin for making its warning on education so dramatic.

The findings of the White House Committee and the threat of the Russian educational challenge appear to be almost forgotten. Many former champions of the schools are strangely silent; too little has been heard from the Senate committee since last March until a few days ago and here we face the closing days of the session with the danger of no school legislation. I hope that this Congress will not go down in history as one that shamefully ignored the security of our country by neglecting our schools—America's first line of defense.

When I think of how much we Members of Congress have said and written about transforming our school system and how little we have actually done, I am reminded of the old axiom, "It is better to light a candle than to curse in the darkness." Up to date, Members of Congress outside of the committees have done little besides complain. Now is the time to light the candle.

The need for Federal legislation has, in my opinion, been fully demonstrated. The people and the youth of our country are giong to be greatly disappointed if this national defense education bill is not passed, with the committee amendment.

By reducing these scholarships from 20,000 to 10,000 and by limiting these scholarships to those exceptionally well qualified young people who cannot afford an education—amendments which the committee itself will offer—the bill conforms to the wishes of the administration. The amendment also removes the criticism that wealthy people's children who should pay their own way could receive scholarships. The amendment also cuts the cost of scholarships to approximately \$7½ million a year, and due to the limitation of need prevents the mushrooming of this program and guards against abuses.

Of the American high-school graduates whose academic ability places them in the upper 25 percent, only 50 percent attend college. Of this group who do not attend, it is estimated that one-half, or 100,000 students, do not attend college because of financial difficulty.

Of the American students whose academic ability places them in the top 2

percent, only 66½ percent attend college.

For every American high-school graduate who ultimately earns a doctoral degree, there are 25 others who have the mental capacity to do so.

Last November Utah was favored with a visit from Chairman ELLIOTT's committee which held hearings in Salt Lake City. In preparation for their coming, I took my son out of his graduate work at the University of Utah to make a study of the need for Federal assistance.

He limited his study to the 1957 top 25 percent of the graduates of high schools situated 25 miles from a college. He received questionnaires back from 80 percent of the group. He made follow-up visits to 12 high schools and 6 colleges and conversed with the principals, students, and parents.

Some significant findings were as follows:

(A) The data obtained from the administrators indicated that:

1. Forty-six and five-tenths percent of the 1957 high-school graduates at the 25 high schools involved in this study are now enrolled in college.

2. Eighty-two and eight-tenths percent of the top quartile of these graduates are now enrolled in college.

(B) The data obtained from the questionnaire study indicated that:

1. Thirty-three and ninety-four one-hundredths percent of these top quartile students enrolled in college anticipated financial difficulties which might force them to withdraw from college prior to graduation.

2. Sixty-one and twenty-two one-hundredths percent of the top quartile students not attending college indicate they would attend if given sufficient financial assistance.

The following probable conclusions can be drawn from the findings:

First. Unless 33.94 percent of Utah's upper quartile students now enrolled in college receive some sort of financial assistance, they may be forced to discontinue their training. This would bring Utah's percentage of upper quartile students now attending college down to 48.88 percent.

Second. The probability is that, with a suitable system of student financial assistance, approximately 93.33 percent of Utah's upper quartile high-school graduates could be induced to attend and remain in college.

Third. The probability is that without a program of student financial assistance, only 48.86 percent of Utah's upper quartile high-school graduates will remain in college.

Other interesting findings are that 84 percent of the students enrolled in college favor some sort of assistance, and 93 percent of those youth not enrolled in college ask for assistance. Ninety-eight and one-half percent indicated that they would definitely be willing to work their way through college if given the opportunity.

This indicates to me that our young people would prefer jobs, fellowships, and even loans, to outright grants. It also indicates that the States can and should do far more in this respect than the Government. The question is: "Are they doing it?"

Another evidence of great need as yet quite unmentioned is the fact that this legislation, by encouraging more choice youth to get in school and to remain in college longer will relieve the unemployment situation. In fiscal 1958 we spent in Federal costs alone for public assistance and unemployment compensation well over \$2 billion.

These youth who should be in college but are working are only taking the jobs of heads of unemployed families. The university performs a great service to society by drawing youth from the labor market in times of unemployment.

The expenditure of less than \$150 million the first year for this legislation would be one of the best investments we could make, if for no other reason than to take youth off the labor market and train them for the jobs that are open. In my own immediate area, there are several thousand attractive openings for the thousands of unemployed people who would like those jobs but lack the training. During the depression of the late thirties, Weber College took more than 500 men off the relief rolls by giving them one winter's technical training.

In my opinion, title VI, which provides \$3 million for only 1,000 fellowships does not go near far enough. We should popularize fellowships, where the student works for what he gets as contrasted to scholarships where he does not work for what he receives. Then again, the fellowship student usually benefits more from the grant than the scholarship student, because the student on a fellowship teaches a class, assists in a laboratory, corrects papers, works on research problems, and other kindred activities where he learns by doing. He also devotes more hours to his field.

Section VI will open the way for more worthy people to enter college teaching by giving them a chance to work their way through the graduate school. It is useless to bring more students into higher education unless we induce more qualified people to enter the teaching field. One reliable commission reports that unless we build college faculties faster and provide facilities for students faster than we are at the present time, by 1970 our institutions will be refusing admittance to 1 out of every 3 applicants.

Last October I visited the University of Southern California, my old alma mater, where I asked the dean of the school of education how many of his majors were preparing to teach. He replied 406. I asked him how many were preparing to teach mathematics or science; his reply was 7. He said further, "Industry is not even leaving us seed corn."

Now, Mr. Chairman, H. R. 13247 is definitely a defense measure and as fully deserves Federal support as our Federal defense training institutions, such as the Air Force Academy, Annapolis, West Point, and others, because our soldiers of the future will be more the soldier of the slide rule than the musket-carrying variety.

The committee that drafted H. R. 13247 has eliminated the objections to title II, which has attracted most of the

criticism to the bill, by cutting the number of scholarships in half and granting them on the basis of need as well as capability. The measure as amended will cost considerably less than \$150 million the first year, and considerably less than the amount budgeted for education. This is not an expenditure but the finest investment in individual independence, in thrift and enlightenment, in citizenship, and in national defense that the Congress could ever make. I urge the passage of the amended bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, this day, Thursday, August 7, 1958, should be a red-letter day on the calendar of the Congress of the United States. It should mark the day on which the duly elected representatives of the people decide to do something about their greatest national asset, our boys and girls; a day on which they decided to not allow the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to tack a dollar sign on the school doors of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I was shocked to hear the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, also the gentleman from New York, the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations, refer to this legislation as crazy legislation. If doing something to help the youth of this country can be called crazy legislation, then I am proud to say that I am glad to be in that classification. Most everyone knows what my efforts have been since coming to the Congress in the field of education.

I was supposed to discuss title 4 of this legislation. Title 4 is the title that covers the Federal grants in aid to the several States, through their school boards, to improve their science laboratories and various other means for teaching technical subjects. I think everybody is agreed that one of the faults of our present secondary school system is the failure to properly train our boys and girls. I do not care how good a teacher might be, and I do not particularly care how well their own basic training was in the elementary and high schools, the fact remains that you cannot properly instruct them without the proper tools. That means that you are going to have to improve your facilities in your high schools.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, the record will disclose here that there are some 26,000 high schools in the Nation, and a surprisingly small percentage of those high schools give thorough instruction in the field of proper laboratory training and proper technical training. I have here a breakdown of that figure. A total of 18.9 percent of our high schools have no facilities for even the elementary sciences.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I will be glad to yield briefly.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Do I understand that the money made available in this title can be used directly for the

purchase of laboratory equipment, if it is needed? Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. The fact is you can rehabilitate every laboratory. The program is a \$60 million annual program for 4 years.

Under this legislation we can in 4 years construct 6,000 newly equipped science laboratories, 6,000 new biology laboratories, 1,500 new chemical laboratories, and 1,200 new physics laboratories.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I appeal to my colleagues and say that there is nothing basically wrong with this legislation. If the corrections are made as it is indicated they will be made, in the nature of amendments, I think it will be good, wholesome legislation. Certainly I would have had no part in spending some 5½ months trying to shape legislation into proper form if it were not good, wholesome legislation. I recommend it highly to my colleagues in the House.

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, for many, many generations, education was limited to the teaching of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Even up to the end of the last century, when children were employed in the mines and factories, the youngster who managed to graduate from high school was looked up to as some sort of a genius.

In addition to the reputation he enjoyed, he also succeeded in earning more money than those of his own age, when he finally went to work after 12 long years of schooling.

We have come a long way in education within the past 60 years, in spite of the fact that there are still a few native-born Americans who are illiterate.

All in all, however, our educational system has concentrated on the training, improvement, and development of the individual, to insure the maximum of personal success. Reliable charts are available to prove that, for each additional year of education, one's ability to make money goes up correspondingly. Only incidentally, and as a byproduct, was it recognized that education contributed to the Nation's progress.

Few saw any relation between higher education and the ability of our Nation to survive in a swiftly changing age of scientific and technological progress, or the vital role of the humanities in guiding education so that it will improve the man himself, even while it is providing him with the special skills to increase his earning power.

Apart from the years of compulsory education, it was "every man for himself." Many able youngsters from poor families were frustrated in their ambitions to secure a higher education, be-

cause there was no way to finance this greatest investment of all.

With the understanding, generosity, and voluntary efforts of many corporations, alumni groups, and private organizations, a number of scholarships are available to qualified students that enable them to secure a higher education, but they fall far short in meeting the need.

Our hit-and-miss attitude toward this problem, and our lack of a concerted national effort to give education the support, encouragement, and priority that is required, was forcibly brought to our attention on October 4, 1957.

The surprising and shocking technical skill demonstrated by the Russians in being the first to thrust a man-made satellite into outer space, awakened us from our apathy.

Suddenly, we realized how dependent we are on education to strengthen the national defense and to meet critical national needs.

While the Russians were concentrating on the education of their promising youth, even to the extent of paying all their expenses, we were neglecting to provide equivalent opportunities for our own deserving students.

H. R. 13247 states that: "The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women."

To achieve that end, this bill will provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, to States and their subdivisions, and to institutions of higher education in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

Of greatest importance is the provision to award scholarships to 25,000 persons, to be known as national defense scholarships. I have advocated such a program in the past, and I am pleased that legislation for this purpose is now receiving the serious attention that it clearly merits.

The second feature of this bill will authorize appropriations to stimulate and assist institutions of higher education to establish funds to make low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study.

Such sums shall be available, for payment of Federal capital contributions which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan funds.

There shall also be grants to the States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools; appropriations for the guidance, counseling, testing, identification, and encouragement of able students; appropriations for expansion of graduate education; appropriations for foreign language development; and appropriations for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related mediums for educational purposes.

Before the sputniks routed us from our complacency and warned us of our edu-

cational shortcomings, Gov. Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts, on January 14, 1957, asked for an overall survey of the needs in Massachusetts higher education. In its report of March 25, 1958, the special commission observed that:

It has been estimated that, by 1970, our (Massachusetts) industry will need an additional 44,000 graduate engineers and at least 100,000 more technicians. * * * At present, for example, Massachusetts is training only about a third of the additional elementary and secondary schoolteachers it needs each year, and the Commonwealth needs at least 10 percent more nurses than it has at present. * * * The present and growing shortage of these trained people adversely affects the competitive position of Massachusetts in the national economy, while the State is increasingly dependent on the new high-skill industries. This shortage is also a serious handicap to the national defense effort, at a time when attention is focused on our need to accelerate greatly our scientific and technical development.

Many national studies estimate that 40 to 50 percent of those with college ability do not now attend college. Even among the top 5 percent of high school graduates, about 4 out of 10 do not go to college.

These figures mean that each year the talents of many thousands of able young men and women are not being fully utilized, despite the belief of American democracy that every individual should have the opportunity to develop his full intellectual and vocational potentialities. These statistics also mean that a great many potential engineers, technicians, doctors, nurses, teachers, and other trained people are being lost to the State of Massachusetts and the Nation. * * * Family income is one of the greatest single factors in determining whether a high-school graduate attempts to continue his education.

A free society cannot ignore the development of those talents in its people upon which it must depend for its very life.

Neither delay nor economy will answer the challenge that is upon us.

A beginning must be made to stimulate and assist education to meet its responsibilities of leadership in these critical times.

H. R. 13247 is the instrumentality by which we can inspire and invigorate education for that decisive role.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolution of the following titles

in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution relative to the reenrollment of S. 359, concerning certain desert land entries; and

S. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution relative to the reenrollment of S. 4002, providing for the construction of the Grey Reef Dam and Reservoir on the North Platte River.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3817. An act to provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12783) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 11, 13, 38, and 55 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13015) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3651) entitled "An act to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns, and for other purposes."

NEEDED ACTION IS NOT FORTHCOMING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday last, August 5, our colleague from the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan, GERALD R. FORD, Jr., who so efficiently represents his constituents—daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 14910—called attention to the lack of law enforcement in Michigan, and especially to the need of a governor who would represent the people, protect their interests, instead of acting as a stooge for the goons who are assisting in driving industry from our State.

Governor Williams is a handsome, smiling, backslapping menial for Reuther and his law-defying crew. He is a political wizard and a State liability.

Williams it is who has provided a haven for Reuther's John Gunaca who cruelly and viciously beat up a Kohler worker who finds safety under the Governor's wing.

Soapy—and the nickname is an insult to a long-time dirt-remover—has long refused to honor the request of Wisconsin's Governor for the return of this individual to Wisconsin for trial.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 11, 1958
For actions of August 8, 1958
35th-2d, No. 136

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments...	12,30	
Adjournment.....	23	
Annual leave.....	1	
Area redevelopment.....	10	
Budgeting.....	10,20	
Butter.....	7	
Cheese.....	7	
Cotton.....	12,30	
Desert land entries.....	3	
Education.....	2	
Employment.....	28	
Expenditures.....	26	
Fair trade.....	25	
Farm program.....	27	
Farmer committeemen.....	11	
Food additives.....	10	
Foreign trade.....	13,22	
Forestry.....	4,17	
Government operations.....	8	
Legislative program..	10,22	
Margarine.....	14	
Mexican farm labor.....	10	
Minerals.....	10	
Oils.....	6	
Packers and stockyards..	10	
Patents.....	29	
Personnel.....	1,16	
Price support.....	30	
Prices.....	28	
Public Law 480.....	13	
REA.....	18	
Reclamation.....	5,10	
Research.....	15	
Rice.....	12,30	
Saline water.....	10	
Statehood.....	21,24	
Surplus commodities.....	13	
Taxation.....	6	
Travel expenses.....	10	
TVA.....	10	
Unemployment compensation.....	1	
Watersheds.....	9	
Weed control.....	19	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill to revise procedures for election of ASC farmer committeemen. Sens. Fulbright and Proxmire discussed effects of cotton acreage reductions. Sen. Humphrey urged enactment of Public Law 480 extension. House passed education bill. Sens. Stennis, Hill and Sparkman submitted and Sen. Stennis discussed measure to continue for 1 year existing acreage allotments for cotton and rice.

HOUSE

1. PERSONNEL. Passed without amendment H. R. 11908, to repeal Sec. 1505 of the Social Security Act so that in determining eligibility of Federal employees for unemployment compensation their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws. p. 15302
2. EDUCATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill (pp. 15303-367). Agreed, 109 to 78, to an amendment by Rep. Judd which struck out a provision of the bill authorizing 4-year scholarships for 10,000 selected students a year (pp. 15348-56). Rejected, 140 to 233, a motion by Rep. Gwinn to recommit the bill to the Education and Labor Committee (p. 15367).
3. DESERT-LAND ENTRIES. Passed without amendment S. Con. Res. 112, to request the President to return for correction enrolled bill S. 359, to permit desert-land entries on disconnected tracts of land up to 320 acres. p. 15369

4. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 3587, to provide for studies and reports by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior on the suitability of establishing a national park in the Wheeler Peak-Helman Caves area, Nev. (H. Rept. 2526). p. 15387
A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment H. R. 13101, to extend the boundaries of the Siskiyou National Forest in Ore. p. D821
 5. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. J. Res. 585, to authorize studies and a report on service to certain Calif. counties from the Central Valley project (H. Rept. 2527). p. 15387
 6. OILS; TAXATION. The Ways and Means Committee reported with amendment H. R. 10239, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt palm oils from tax during the first domestic processing (H. Rept. 2530). p. 15387
 7. BUTTER; CHEESE. The Ways and Means Committee reported with amendment S. 2006, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to relieve the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy from sitting with the Secretary of Agriculture on appeal boards which decide appeals from decisions of the Secretary of Treasury on cases involving deleterious ingredients in butter or oleomargarine or in any substance used in the manufacture of so-called filled cheese (H. Rept. 2531). p. 15387
 8. GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS. Received the report of the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. 2533). p. 15387
 9. WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture Committee approved the following watershed projects: Furnace, Brook-Middle River, Conn. and Mass.; Busseron, Ind.; and Crooked Creek, Iowa. p. D821
 10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced the following legislative program: Mon., Aug. 11: the following bills will be considered under suspension of the rules: H. R. 9020, Packers and Stockyards bill; H. R. 13254, chemical food additive bill; S. J. Res. 135, construction of saline water plant; S. 4009, increased authorization for Washoe reclamation project; S. J. Res. 585, study of services of Central Valley project; and S. 1903, travel expenses for employees to posts outside the U. S.; Tues., Aug. 12: H. R. 8002, accrued expenditures budgeting bill, and H. R. 10360, extension of Mexican farm labor program; Wed., Aug. 13: Private Calendar, and S. 3683, area redevelopment bill; and for the remainder of the week, if rules are granted, S. 4035, the housing bill: S. 1869, TVA power programs financing bill; and S. 4036, minerals stabilization payments bill. pp. 15362-63
- SENATE
11. FARMER COMMITTEEMEN. Passed with amendments S. 1436, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to revise the procedures governing the election of farmer committeemen and the administration of the farm program by the committees. Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Stennis to strike out the provision prohibiting the State Director of the Extension Service from voting on the State committee. Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Aiken to provide that (in general) the Secretary shall choose one of three elected nominees selected by the county committees, and appoint two others, to the State committees. As amended, the Committee amendments were adopted. pp. 15262, 15289-94

profits by renegotiation to which section 322 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies, but only with respect to claims resulting from renegotiations for taxable years ending after December 31, 1952.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) section 6511 (d) (2) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special period of limitations with respect to net operating loss carrybacks) is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: 'except that if a net operating loss carryback is created by the elimination of excessive profits by a renegotiation (as defined in sec. 1481 (a) (1) (A)), the period shall not expire before September 1, 1959, or the expiration of the 12th month following the month in which the agreement or order for the elimination of such excessive profits becomes final, whichever is the later.'"

"(b) Section 322 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to special period of limitations with respect to net operating loss carrybacks) is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: 'except that if a net operating loss carryback is created by the elimination of excessive profits by a renegotiation (as defined in sec. 3806 (a) (1) (A)), the period shall not expire before September 1, 1959, or the expiration of the 12th month following the month in which the agreement or order for the elimination of such excessive profits becomes final, whichever is the later.'"

"(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to claims for credit or refund resulting from the elimination of excessive profits by renegotiation to which section 6511 (d) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 applies. The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to claims for credit or refund resulting from the elimination of excessive profits by renegotiation to which section 322 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies, but only with respect to claims resulting from renegotiations of excessive profits received or accrued for taxable years ending after December 31, 1952."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the general rule provided by the Internal Revenue Code with respect to claims for credit or refund provides that such claims must be filed within 3 years from the time the return giving rise to the credit or refund is filed or 2 years from the time the tax is paid, whichever period expires later. However, net operating losses create a special problem and a special rule is now provided by the code to take care of this problem. Thus, existing law provides that if a claim for credit or refund relates to an overpayment of tax arising from the carryback of a net operating loss, the period in which such claim may be filed is that period ending 38½ months following the end of the taxable year in which the net operating loss arose. Generally speaking, this special period is adequate to protect taxpayers in the ordinary net

operating loss carryback situation. However, in cases where the net operating loss arises as a result of the restoration of excessive profits pursuant to renegotiation, the period is not adequate, since renegotiation and the appeals resulting therefrom to the Tax Court of the United States, and under the bill recently extending the Renegotiation Act to June 30, 1959, to the courts of appeals, the period during which the taxpayer is at risk with respect to a net operating loss can and will often exceed 38½ months. Since it is unfair that the Government should require the restoration of excessive profits on the one hand and deny the taxpayer a credit or refund of the taxes paid with respect to such profits, your committee's bill, as amended, provides a new rule for both the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 stating that in the case of a net operating loss arising from the elimination of excessive profits by renegotiation, the period for filing a claim for credit or refund shall not expire until 12 months after the month in which the agreement or order for the elimination of the excessive profits becomes final.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in ordering the bill favorably reported. I urge its adoption by the House.

(Mr. REED (at the request of Mr. MILLS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 13173, as amended, on which the House has just taken favorable action, would remove an inequitable hardship that occurs under existing law. This hardship arises under circumstances of a contract with the Federal Government being renegotiated and the contractor being required to pay back certain excessive profits to the Federal Government. The renegotiation occurred considerably after the year in which the income arising under the contract was reported for income-tax purposes. Where such a renegotiation results in a net operating loss carryback, the tax liability of the taxpayer for the second or first prior year would ordinarily be reduced. However, where the renegotiation procedure was not completed until long after the time for filing a claim for credit or refund had expired, such a carryback would be denied under existing law. It is desirable that the taxpayer not be denied a carryback under such circumstances, and this legislation would remedy the inequitable result that occurs under existing law.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 160]

Anderson,	Evins	Lesinski
Mont.	Fino	Loser
Ashley	Frazier	Mason
Baker	Friedel	Michel
Barden	Gordon	Morris
Baring	Gray	Moss
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Oreg.	Murray
Blitch	Gregory	Preston
Boykin	Halleck	Radwan
Brooks, La.	Healey	Rivers
Buckley	Höbert	Robeson, Va.
Burdick	Hillings	Rogers, Tex.
Celler	Horan	Shelley
Christopher	James	Shuford
Colmer	Jenkins	Slominski
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Calif.
Dellay	Kearney	Smith, Kans.
Dies	Kilburn	Spence
Diggs	Krueger	Vorys
Eberhart	Landrum	Winstead
Engle	Latham	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SCHOLARSHIP AND LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of education programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 13247, with Mr. FOGARTY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] had 27 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] had 26 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my personal appreciation to this outstanding committee for a bill which I believe is one of the most imaginative and one of the most far-sighted pieces of legislation we have had the opportunity to consider this session. I wholeheartedly support H. R. 13247.

Mr. Chairman, whatever may be said in criticism of this bill—and it has its imperfections as do all things—the measure nonetheless represents the most constructive effort presented to the 85th Congress in a field on which our Nation's future depends.

Education is the only solid foundation on which we can base our hopes for the survival and supremacy of the democratic ideal in today's world.

While local responsibility and initiative are paramount in the American educational system, we in the Congress have long recognized a national responsibility as well—the responsibility to see that

educational opportunity is available to all American children.

The case has been well and solidly made that many American children today do not have true educational opportunity in some fields.

In this situation, the United States is the loser, and we lose ground we sorely need in the world of 1958.

The several different programs established under H. R. 13247 are substantial efforts to regain that lost ground and advance the national interest through education, and I urge the approval of this bill.

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

(Mr. ABBITT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to express my views on this legislation.

I am opposed to the bill now under consideration known as the Education Act of 1958. It is simply another means of putting the Federal Government into the business of taking over the education of the youth of America.

Apparently, those who are seriously for this bill believe that the Federal Government can bribe schools into doing their job. In my opinion, the bureaucrats in the United States Office of Education are not the people who should administer the education program of the various States. The picture of understaffed, under-housed and under-financed schools, which is frequently presented to the public by those who are desirous of the Federal Government taking over the educational systems of the States and localities, is a mere fabrication of propagandists. I do not believe the lack of money is responsible for the short-comings of the schools. There have been too many innovations into the public school system already. What we need is a return to the basic, fundamental principles and bring information to the pupils rather than the modern curriculum of letting the students do what they wish and study when they please.

All of us realize that in many instances our educational system is not strong enough. Our college curriculum must be strengthened; our secondary and elementary systems are not nearly as efficient as they should be but the strengthening of educational systems should be done at the State and local levels. The picture of strong, centralized government in Russia and many other foreign countries is too alarming to justify the changing of our school system, taking it away from the communities and the States and placing it in the hands of bureaucrats in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The primary responsibility for education is in the local communities and States and higher educational institutions. There it must remain if our Democratic way of life is to be retained.

Last year, we witnessed an all-out effort by certain segments of our educators to put over a school construction bill. They told us it was necessary that the Federal Government get into the school construction picture if education was to survive. They lost that fight and we all now realize that there was no need for Federal aid for the construction of schools. It was a mere farce and an attempt on the part of some of our people to have the Federal Government take over the schools of America. That same little group, and I am not talking about the sincere people who are earnestly interested in improving our educational system, are now attempting to get the Federal Government's hands on the schools of America by entering the back door in the name of national defense and are basing their plea upon the international emergency now confronting the world.

This bill is but a means of getting the Federal Government in the public school field.

It is thought by this little group heretofore referred to that they would have a better chance of passing this type of legislation than they would a bill for general Federal aid. They desire to get the Government's foot in the door, knowing full well that once the Federal Government gets in the education field there will be no chance of its removal but, rather, they will get in further and further, deeper and deeper, and in a few short years our entire educational system will be a part of the Federal bureaucracy.

As just stated, there are those in this country who are determined that the Federal Government take over the operation of the schools of our Nation. They are using this legislation as a stepping-stone toward their goal.

This legislation, if passed, will greatly endanger the future freedom of our people. The question to be decided in passing upon this legislation is very simple. We must decide whether the public schools are to be operated, maintained, and controlled by the localities and the States or whether the public schools of the Nation are to be turned over eventually to the Federal Government.

Our schools have been the foundation stone of our democracy. We must know that as the Federal Government gradually takes over the financial burden of the schools so will they take over the control of them. It is impossible to distribute Federal funds for public education without the imposition of a corresponding increasing measure of Federal control. Local control is fundamental and necessary to the continuation of our republican form of government. To remove the responsibility of educating our children from the local level will necessarily and unavoidably weaken democracy at the grassroots. The separation of education and the Federal Government is as important as the separation of church and state.

There is now an all-out effort to federalize the schools and nationalize the lives of all American citizens. Many of the proponents of this legislation desire the concentration of power in Washington with all government at the national

level. We know that the adequate education of America's youth is essential to the preservation of the Republic and the welfare of the Nation. This can be provided by localities and States more satisfactory and equitably than by the Federal Government.

If we are to remain a free people and desire to retain our way of life, it is necessary that the control of the public of the public schools remain at the local level. There is no such thing as Federal aid without Federal control, nor is there any such thing as a Federal handout.

The localities and the States are better able financially to provide the necessary educational opportunities for our youth. The States are better off financially than is the monstrous Federal Government today. There are those who would have us believe that the States are not able financially to carry on the proper educational program to meet the needs of our youth. They contend that the Federal Government has the financial ability to undertake this great task. Unfortunately, nothing is further from the truth. Sadly enough, the national debt now amounts to more than eight times State and local indebtedness. The Federal Government has a national debt of approximately \$275 billion. Apparently, there is no hope in the foreseeable future that this debt will be reduced in any appreciable amount. It is saddening to see on all sides grasping bureaucrats and people who believe in centralized power trying to reach out on behalf of the Federal Government to continue to take over functions and obligations of the States and local communities. We are now at the crossroads. We are about to see this country embark on a gigantic longtime journey into the field of local public education. It is disheartening to me to see this administration sponsor such a program.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to learn that the House Committee on Education and Labor has reported out H. R. 13247, designed to assist in the improvement and strengthening of the American educational system at all levels and to encourage qualified, ambitious students to continue their education beyond the high-school level.

The bill, in my opinion, represents a good beginning toward the solution of one of the Nation's most important problems; namely, the strengthening and readjustment of our educational system across the board to provide adequate teaching, broader opportunities for study, and adaptation to recent and current developments in scientific and technological fields.

I do not intimate, in my reference to science, that I believe our educational system should be geared to scientific education alone. To be sure, there is room for great improvement and broad

development in scientific education, but in our overall educational scheme, we must never overestimate science or any other specialty. The maintenance of the arts and sciences and humane letters in our system is not only desirable, but a necessary objective, and this type of training, which is essential to the development of generalist thinking, ability, and orientation, must be stressed, because it is basic to our way of life.

There are many maladjustments in our educational system that I will not discuss here. Clearly, in the light of current juvenile problems, the Nation may well ask what can be done in our schools, as well as in the homes, to ease the shocking conditions that have grown up in many communities throughout the land, illustrated by the outlook and conduct of some of the younger generation who, fortunately, are not typical of American youth.

The bill has several very desirable objectives: Federal scholarships; loans for students at institutions of higher education; grants to the States for strengthening science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction in the public schools; language institutions and area centers to expand and improve the teaching of languages; expansion of graduate education; improvement of guidance, counseling, and testing programs; research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, motion picture, and related media for educational purposes; improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

In my opinion, this bill marks a distinct and necessary step forward in American education, the increased cost of which has militated against many struggling, ambitious young people in their efforts to secure training in accordance with their aspirations. In this great, rich country, there must be an opportunity for every capable, worthy boy or girl to secure higher education. This has special significance in the case of exceptionally talented students, and it is imperative that Congress and the States move as rapidly as possible to eliminate actual and potential waste of the intellectual resources and abilities of our young people and insure for them proper educational training.

To be sure, there are many, who are able to get higher training on their own. The problem of members of this group is not usually financial or economic because their parents or relatives have the means to finance their education, or they work their way through school. As to the members of this group, however, who do not possess outstanding secondary school records, their problem these days is the difficult one of getting into any college at all.

Because of the pressure of the large number annually seeking college admission, many capable, ambitious and promising young people are unable to secure admission to the college of their choice, or cannot be considered for admission, and are required to abandon their plans for higher education or settle for some lesser training for which they may not have the aptitude or special fitness that they would have for the training of their choice.

The questions often asked are:

Are the standards too high?

Are many young people of ability, zeal, and promise, highly endowed with qualities that make for success and leadership, being deprived by abnormally high standards and limited educational facilities of the opportunity to pursue the careers of their choice?

Will the ultimate result of such a trend be to exclude large number of well-balanced, highly qualified youth, who cannot in a period of hot competition for limited billets achieve the degree of scholarship required for admission to colleges and professional schools of their choice, but, who are well-fitted for higher training and capable, if given the chance, of developing into leaders in American life?

It is felt by many educators and other leaders that the Soviet competition in arms, in science, in political expansion, in culture and other fields poses a challenge and a threat to our survival. This competition applies to every part of our system. It constitutes, not only a conflict, but a race for military, scientific, social and cultural supremacy. It may well be viewed as a race to capture the minds of men and women throughout the world. It is developing ominously into a mad race toward political instability, social disintegration and even war.

One of the foundations of our system is that vigorous competition is healthy and constructive. Obviously, this principle cannot be applied to an arms race because such a competition involves waste of resources and untold perils. But until the Soviet takes a different attitude and acts to promote genuine world peace, we are left with no choice other than to strengthen our system in every sense and in every way, so that our national potential will not be excelled.

It is obvious to me that the strengthening of our educational facilities and advantages is of paramount importance. We must provide every opportunity for the young men and women of America to get the kind of training and education, according to their aptitude and abilities, that are needed in current day life and that will be even more important in the world of the future. Above all we must be resolved to face the threats to our survival with courage and wise action. We must accept every challenge flung to us by the Soviet. We are free and our freedom gives us great advantages over the slaves of the Marxist system. If we but arouse ourselves to the dangers, no dictator can ever conquer or defeat us.

This bill acknowledges that primary responsibility for education should remain with the States, local communities, and higher educational institutions since education is, in the American tradition, a function of local self-government. At the same time, however, the bill provides for a constructive, helpful role by the Federal Government, which should permit encouragement and assistance to the States, local communities, and higher educational institutions in striving to meet their critical educational needs, which are in every sense of the word national needs.

It is a question how long our educational system, as presently constituted, can continue to function efficiently without imposing even greater tax burdens upon the local communities and the States. For this reason, resort to the Federal taxing power is sought in the field of education to insure a national educational program that will meet our national demands and needs in which neither the States nor the local communities want Federal control of education. On the other hand, the Federal Government probably would not make huge sums available for educational purposes without exercising control over expenditure and at least some measure of control over policy.

The people, as a whole, take a dim view of control of their educational facilities by an expanded Federal bureaucracy dictating the direction and conduct of their local schools. But there is a middle ground in this controversy, which I think is illustrated by this bill, even though it does not go as far as many people desire to cope with current drawbacks, disadvantages, and inadequacies.

I personally believe that a constitutional, feasible way can be found in the public interest for the Federal Government to guide, encourage, and assist the States and local communities with their educational problems without infringing upon historic patterns of local self-government, which are so dear to the American people.

There is danger too in gearing our educational system to the development of a race of supermen and superwomen concerned only with intellectual pursuits, exclusive scientific horizons, and social experiments. American education must never be allowed to become lopsided on one side or another. It must provide broad, adequate facilities for all our young citizens and at the same time it must scrupulously avoid Federal regimentation and over-emphasis upon science, technology or purely intellectual activities alone, since in the short or long run a worthwhile American educational system must be predicated on breadth and depth rather than fancy and overweening size.

It is quality, not quantity alone, that we must seek in our higher education, but that quality must extend to and embrace all educational fields and not just science and mathematics. As important as these subjects are, they must be part of a composite picture, which includes all fields of learning and particularly those fields that relate to the welfare and betterment of man as an individual being endowed with a human soul rather than as a robot responsive to the tick of some scientific gadget. The spiritual must ever prevail as the dominant feature of our system.

It is stark tragedy whenever any young person in this great country, possessed of ability, talent, and aspiration, is denied for financial reasons the opportunity to advance his objectives of higher education. Insofar as such a condition exists, government at every level must take effective measures to insure educational opportunities for all qualified youth, who aspire to self-development and self-advancement.

That there are such instances in the Nation is attested by statements of some educators. I may say, however, that in my experience in my own district and State, I have not seen many instances where qualified students were not able in some way, either by self-help and work, loans or scholarships, to attend college and to pursue higher learning. Education in America should not exist merely for the select few. It must be universal. Every qualified boy and girl must be assured of the opportunity to aspire for it and to receive it, and it would be a sad and sorry spectacle indeed if bright, highly-qualified youth should ever be deprived of the educational training of their choice because of the lack of financial means.

The development of qualified, trained teachers is admittedly another very important part of our national education program. There must be a sustained drive to provide an adequate number of teachers highly trained in modern techniques. Unquestionably, the current shortage of teachers in some places is bound up with low or inadequate pay scales and it is important to raise these scales so as to attract qualified persons into this vital field and insure them compensation rates commensurate with the importance of their work and the dignity and high value of their profession. Thus, the encouragement of graduate education provided for in this bill to those who propose to enter teaching as a profession is timely and constructive.

While the cost of the bill is high and involves over a billion dollars over its basic 4-year period, it will be worth the cost, in my opinion, because it should greatly help to stimulate interest in higher education, encourage adequate facilities and desirable guidance and counsel for many young people, who, as a consequence of higher learning, will in years to come pay rich national dividends on the investment the Nation is making in their educational careers.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 13247. This is one of the most progressive and vital pieces of legislation that has come before the Congress in many years, not only because of the obvious advantages that accrue to a democratic form of Government through the high standards of the education of its citizens, but more important, in these times, for its future preservation from a defense standpoint.

This bill is accurately and prophetically named the defense education bill. Defense is no longer a matter of muscles and masses. It has rapidly become and will in the future be a matter mainly of the mind. The most potent weapon of defense in the arsenal of any nation is now the educated brain. Formulas and equations have taken the place of spears and guns.

Time and space have replaced maneuver and terrain.

In the matter of defense, there has been a gradual and almost imperceptible evolution from prehistoric days to

the present; from the brawn of one man to the brain of one man.

Before the days of nations, cities, villages, or even groups, the first type of defense was the bare hands of a human and the muscles in his back. Subsequently, individuals banded together for protection and massed their hands and backs. It was said in numbers there is strength.

Someone then devised a club. After that came spears, knives, and swords. These kept his enemies a short distance away and developed different methods of protection. After that came gun powder, the gun, the cannon, and the bomb. For centuries these were used together with great masses of people. The matter of brain and brawn was becoming more balanced. Strategy and tactics began to become more important.

Then the American scientific brain reached into the mysteries of the atom and a few short years ago the ancient concept of defense was obliterated. The educated mind at last gained dominance over mere brute strength.

This scientific and military revolution had a deeper significance. It now logically followed that defense weapons and military strategy as we had long known them would not primarily be located on maps or in arsenals, but rather in the human brain.

It was only yesterday that an item appeared in the press informing us that a missile called Bomarc was launched in Florida by means of a pushbutton 1,500 miles away in Kingston, N. Y. The meaning of this is most obvious. We are reaching the point where one man with one pushbutton in one second may ultimately constitute the defense of this great Nation. The millions of marchers and the tons of equipment heretofore used will eventually become obsolete.

Those who argue, and I concede, most sincerely, that education is not a matter for the Federal Government and who also urge that the proponents of this bill are visionaries, are themselves, in fact, the dreamers. No matter what else may be said of the Russians, we know they are utter realists. They comprehend the meaning and the basic value of education as a weapon. Their ability to launch a sputnik is evidence of this.

The legislation before us, although providing for large numbers of grants, does not have its most important value in the number of Americans who will be the recipients of the scholarships, but rather in the hope that out of this number will develop the one or more great minds which will provide us with the genius brainpower that we need. Who among us will not concede that there are thousands of such potentially capable young Americans who would not be given this opportunity, and who we could not find without this legislation.

The opponents of this measure have cited the matter of cost, of balanced budget, of fiscal aggravation. I do not profess to be a qualified economist. I cannot determine what makes a budget balance or how to equalize a trade bal-

ance or what the real effect of increasing the debt limit will be. In these matters I prefer to follow the lead of those I consider more knowledgeable. But this I do know, that the credit, the power, and the respect of a nation is not built solely upon its fiscal responsibility. History reveals that great nations have not survived despite great economic wealth. As a matter of fact, this alone has caused the decay and destruction of many of them. Unlike business and commerce, which must maintain itself solely on a firm economic basis, a government's credit depends also on the loyalty and integrity of its citizens, and mainly upon its ability to defend itself and the knowledge of the rest of the world that it so can do.

No one knows the credit balance of the Russian Treasury, nor of its deficit, nor of its fiscal policy. These matters are kept in utter secrecy, but the value of the ruble rose with the sputnik, which was a scientific and military, but not a monetary, asset.

Thus we see that in these days money alone will not protect us either from our friends or enemies. For proof of this we need only read the daily press, even in a most cursory manner.

Realistically the nations of the world see now what the opponents of this defense measure refuse to understand, that defense is now based mainly upon education, and, therefore, education is the true defense.

We shall pass this bill today, and it will cost the people of this country something, and that is, a great deal of money. It will not cost them their families, their villages, their cities, their country, or their lives. These it will tend to insure for our people will be buying a secured future with an educated American brain.

There is a cost for everything. Sometimes it is money, sometimes lives, sometimes both. In balance, the cost of this legislation appears well worth the dollar cost. It will avoid payment of the other kind. I urge your support of H. R. 13247.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, while one of the primary aims of this bill is to arrest the great loss of talent occurring today in our country, as I tried to illustrate on yesterday, it does not overlook the fact that today sufficient attention is not being given to the fields of mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages. Insofar as these subjects are concerned, our committee found that there is today a very great imbalance with respect to the study of those languages, the sciences and mathematics, as against the other subjects. Today the percentage of students taking chemistry, physics, algebra, and geometry is less than the percentage taking these courses in 1890; fewer today percentage-wise studying those hard subjects than was true 70 years ago.

Of all the public schools in America, 56 percent of them offer no instruction in foreign languages. Nearly 26 percent of all our high schools offer neither chemistry nor physics.

Mr. Chairman, in State after State the requirements for high-school graduation show only one unit of science and

one unit of mathematics as requisites for graduation. Only three States have full-time supervision in mathematics and science.

Studies have estimated that one-half of the high schools in America do not have the necessary equipment for teaching science and modern foreign languages. Only 60 high schools in America have electronic laboratory equipment for training in hearing and speaking the modern foreign languages—only 60 out of 27,000.

This bill does take into account our national needs without infringing on the National Science Foundation and what it is doing. We do this by giving preference in awarding scholarships to those with superior ability and aptitude in the fields of science, mathematics and foreign languages, but we do not control the choice of study of the individual once he has received a scholarship.

After the committee had looked into that question carefully and closely, I will say, Mr. Chairman, to the Members of this House, we came to the conclusion that that ought not to be done.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, there are numerous reasons why we should oppose H. R. 13247. First of all, it is not a bill to strengthen national defense nor is there anything in the bill that would encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs. We must be honest with ourselves and label it as just another Federal aid to education bill.

Quoting from the Washington Daily News editorial of August 7, 1958:

This simply is a part of the irresponsible push toward bigger Federal deficits; more power here in Washington and less for the States and the people themselves.

I agree with the writer of this editorial and with the general expression of editorial writers and columnists that have come to my attention in many of the Nation's leading newspapers.

Furthermore, this bill is another attempt at intervention in State and local affairs. Only recently by a very large majority, the House passed a bill that would attempt to redefine the authority of the States and establish the amount of degree of preemption of authority that the Constitution provides for the Federal Government. This bill would be another one of the chipping away processes of this principle.

I am going to consider this bill in its application to my home State of Indiana. Perhaps Indiana is above average but any State can do a good job in the education field if it so desires. Personally, I spent 12 years as a member of the school board of my home city in Indiana; 4 years as president of the State School Administrators Association; 3 years as a member of the Indiana School Study Commission; and I was author and cosponsor in the Indiana General Assembly of the school fund distribution bill which still is used as a standard in my home State. I men-

tion these personal facts only to indicate my unswerving loyalty to the public school system and to indicate my sincere interest in the furtherance of the educational standards.

I want to retain public schools—not Government schools—for the present and future generations.

Another reason that the effects of this bill should be weighed very carefully is due to the fact that it might have a tendency to damage the financial structure of our colleges. Dr. Frank Sparks, former president and now chairman of the board of Wabash College, my alma mater, is serving at the present time as head of a national organization to secure private and corporation contributions to colleges.

Dr. Sparks has written to me as follows:

Any action on the part of the Federal Government to enter this field is almost certain to mean a major setback to the dramatic growth of voluntary giving. It is altogether possible that the shrinkage in voluntary contributions would be greater than the total help from Government.

There has been much discussion about scholarships and it is an established fact as reported by the colleges that many of these available scholarships are not being used. Concern has been expressed that a large segment of our intellectually able young people are unable to go to college. This concern can be dismissed because the old adage, "Where there is a will, there is a way" still holds true.

All of you know of young men who have worked their way through college and have been successful in later life. I know one man who entered Wabash College at the same time that I entered, and all that he ever received from his family was \$25 from his policeman father. It is true that he worked very hard, waiting on tables, cleaning house, as a bellhop at the hotel, on a laundry route, and any menial chore that would produce a few extra dollars. He earned his letter in football, was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, and today he is one of the distinguished alumni who is a financial success in his chosen field. This friend of mine has said to me that he wishes that many other young people might have enjoyed the training experience that was forced upon him in order that the true American spirit could be developed in the present-day college students.

Another reason that I referred to Indiana is due to the fact that only recently the Indiana committee released the results of their study which help to prove this point. The State superintendent of public instruction formed a committee after the first sputnik was announced and this committee was charged with the study of the very specific problem that the proponents of this legislation present.

Seven hundred and seven high-school principals reported that approximately 2,000 seniors could qualify for scholarships according to need, interest, and ability.

Seven hundred and three of these 2,000 took competitive examinations in mathematics and science and social

studies and English. One hundred and ninety-nine, or 28.3 percent, made a percentile rating above 90 in the areas of mathematics and science.

One hundred and seventy-nine, or 89.9 percent, were considered to come in the category of needing financial assistance.

Of these 179, 14 stated that they had sufficient funds to attend college 1 year; 23 did not answer the questionnaire necessary to determine the need formula; 25 expressed plans to enter fields other than mathematics and science.

Of the 117 remaining students, the need formula eliminated 64. This left 53 who were qualified according to need, interest, and ability.

Thirty-seven of these already had scholarships ranging in value from \$25 to \$750.

Sixteen were left with no help of any kind.

I include the following report, Mathematics and Science Education in Indiana Schools, by Wilbur Young, State superintendent of public instruction:

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION IN INDIANA SCHOOLS

(By Wilbur Young, State superintendent of public instruction)

Russian advances in the field of satellites have been responsible for criticisms of our science and mathematics education by critics of our educational system. Because of the interest expressed by the school people and the citizens in the veracity of these criticisms, the State superintendent of public instruction appointed a 14-member committee with Clarence Manion, former dean of the Notre Dame Law School and a member of the commission on general education of the Indiana State Board of Education, to investigate and appraise science and mathematics education in the schools of Indiana. This, in part, was necessitated because the schools were being blamed for the failure of the United States to launch a satellite before Russia's Sputnik I, and in part because the school people and the citizens wanted to know the truth about Indiana's educational adequacy. The committee has scientifically studied the schools in Indiana to determine the actual facts in five areas of our educational program pertinent to the teaching and achievements in the mathematics and science courses. These areas are as follows: (1) Teacher qualifications; (2) high school offerings; (3) pupil participation; (4) achievement of pupils; and (5) the need for scholarships for talented pupils. To obtain pertinent data the committee used the records of the teacher training and licensing division, the statistical division, and the research division of the State Department of Public Instruction. In addition to this, questionnaires were mailed to all of the 707 Indiana high schools. The fact that 100 percent of the questionnaires were returned is indicative of the excellent cooperation and true interest shown by the school administrators in aiding with this quest for the truth. Investigation of the five areas listed above has been completed and a summary of the results is as follows:

TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS

The courses taken in colleges and/or universities by all the teachers of mathematics and science were studied by examining their credentials filed in the Teacher Training and Licensing Division of the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction. These records show that all mathematics teachers in Indiana have a minimum of 24 semester

hours of college credit in mathematics. Data from these files also reveal that approximately 80 percent of the biology, chemistry, and physics teachers have a teaching certificate in their specific area which, in fact, means that the biology teachers have a minimum of 24 semester hours of academic biology, and the chemistry of physics teachers have a minimum of 18 semester hours of academic chemistry and academic physics. All of the other teachers, with the exception of a very small percent, have had at least 15 hours of science. For only 2.2 percent of the biology teachers, 1 percent of the chemistry teachers, and 2.2 percent of the physics teachers were our records incomplete.

HIGH-SCHOOL OFFERINGS

The idea has been prevalent that our high schools no longer offer the challenging and solid courses in mathematics and science. The facts are that during the 1957-58 school year 85 percent of our high schools were offering physics; 83 percent were offering chemistry; 88 percent were offering second-year algebra; 72 percent were offering trigonometry, and 62 percent were offering solid geometry. All of these schools did not offer these subjects each year but offered the courses in alternate years.

PUPIL ENROLLMENT

During the school year 1957-58 the records showed that 100 percent of the graduating seniors had at least 1 year of mathematics; 34 percent had 2 years of mathematics; 15 percent had 3 years of mathematics, and 11 percent had 4 years of mathematics. Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard and former United States High Commissioner to Germany, recently used, in a nationwide telecast, our data that 11 percent of Indiana graduates have 4 years of secondary mathematics, as an indication of the strength of the American comprehensive secondary school. Of this year's (1957-58) graduates, 100 percent had 1 year of science; 26 percent had 2 years of science; 15 percent had 3 years of science; 2 percent had 4 years of science. These figures indicate that about as many high-school pupils in Indiana today are enrolled in advanced science and mathematics courses as could profit from the accelerated study of these subjects. This statement assumes that it is the most capable and talented students who are enrolled in these advanced courses.

ACHIEVEMENT OF PUPILS

The Science and Mathematics Committee tested the ninth-grade pupils in mathematics and science. The California Test Bureau of Los Angeles, Calif., was selected to provide the tests in mathematics and science. Schools were invited to participate on a voluntary basis. Of the approximately 63,000 pupils enrolled in the ninth grade, over 44,000 students took both the science and the mathematics test.

The results of these tests have very definitely established the high caliber of our students both in past and present achievement and in the prognostication of their future scholastic ability and achievement.

The tests were validated on the national norms previously established and grade placements were also derived and ascertained from these national norms.

In the area of mathematics, the median grade level for Indiana's ninth-grade students was at the tenth grade. Approximately 27 percent of the total number of ninth-grade students taking the test showed a grade equivalent of 13 (college level) or more, while approximately 58 percent showed grade equivalents at or above the tenth year grade level.

In the area of physical science, the median grade level for these ninth-grade students was at the ninth-grade level; however, 36 percent of the students taking the physical science exam showed a tenth-grade equivalent or more.

In the area of biological science, the median grade level was the ninth grade, the same as in the area of physical science. Thirty-four percent of the ninth grade students taking this test placed at the 10th grade equivalent or more.

Results show that 61.6 percent were above the national norms in mathematical reasoning and mathematical fundamentals, and 50.7 percent were above the national norms in physical and biological sciences. More students were above the national norms in physical science than in biological science because many city schools offer biology to 10th grade students while the test was given to 9th grade students.

THE NEED FOR SCHOLARSHIPS FOR TALENTED PUPILS

A questionnaire was sent to the 707 high school principals in Indiana asking the following question:

"How many students in your school qualify by the way of interest, ability, and aptitude in science and mathematics to perform successful college work; how many do you estimate are unable to attend college because of lack of financial resources?"

The replies to this question indicated that there were approximately 2,000 students who had the interest, ability, and aptitude for science and mathematics but lacked the funds needed for higher education.

A 4½ hour comprehensive examination in science, mathematics, English, and social studies was given to all seniors wanting to take the examination. Of the estimated 2,000 qualified pupils who needed aid as reported on the questionnaires, 703 of these pupils took this comprehensive examination and the results were sent to Yonkers, N. Y., where they were machine scored.

There were 199 of the 703 pupils who ranked above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science based on national norms. The 199 pupils were then divided into 4 categories:

1. Twenty-seven pupils were counted in group I that included all pupils making above the 90th percentile based on national norms in each of the 4 fields of mathematics, science, English, and social studies.

2. Seventy-three pupils were counted in group II that included all pupils making above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science, and a percentile average of above 90 in the 4 areas tested.

3. Ninety-nine pupils were counted in group III that included all pupils ranking above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science but making a percentile rating of 90 or lower in English and social studies.

The committee decided to consider at this time any of those pupils in the group III for scholarship aid who had a percentile ranking of 95 or above in mathematics and science. This consideration included 179 of the 199 students. These students were asked concerning their ability to finance their higher education. Twenty-three students did not reply and it was assumed they had financial resources for attending college. Fourteen students stated that they had sufficient funds to attend a college or university of their own choice for 1 year. Twenty-five students advised the committee that they were going into fields other than mathematics and science in higher education therefore automatically eliminating themselves.

A need formula was applied to the 117 remaining and qualified pupils. This formula has been widely used throughout the United States to determine, first, the financial need necessary and, second, the amount of financial aid required in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

Sixty-four students were eliminated by the formula, leaving 53 qualifying for aid for amounts from \$10 to \$1,200. Of the 53 qualifying for financial aid, 37 already had scholarships ranging from \$25 to \$750.

The committee learned that the problem at hand was not to provide scholarships as only 16 are needed and can be taken care of but the problem concerns provision for financial assistance for those already having scholarships in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

A plan is being devised whereby the 53 needing financial aid in order to complete 1 year of college education may secure that aid providing, of course, they enroll in college this fall and make satisfactory grades.

The results of the study of these five areas have shown conclusively that the training and education directed to our students do not in any way preclude their ability to achieve and to meet the challenges of our changing world.

The facts do show that our schools are very adequately meeting the needs, interests, and abilities of the pupils. Therefore, there is no basis whatsoever for unfavorable criticisms concerning Indiana's educational system. The aims, the objectives, and the philosophy of our schools sharpen and challenge the working tools of the pupils. Since progress is an important product, our youth will not mark time but will keep pace with all the developmental tasks that our culture expects of them.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE FIVE AREAS

Teacher qualifications: The records of Indiana's mathematics and science teachers show that they are well qualified to teach in these subject areas.

High-school offerings: Indiana's high schools are definitely offering adequate mathematics and science courses to meet the needs of our challenging students.

Pupil enrollment: The records show that Indiana's high-school seniors for 1957-58 had a firm and substantial background in both mathematics and science.

Achievement of pupils: Results of a mathematics and science test showed that in the area of mathematics, the medium-grade level for Indiana's 9th-grade students was at the 10th grade. A large percentage of these students ranked at the grade equivalent of 13 (college level) or more.

In the science area, the medium-grade level was the 9th grade, while a large percentage ranked at the 10th-grade equivalent or more.

The need for scholarships for talented pupils: A 4½-hour comprehensive examination (essential high school content battery—form BM) was taken by 703 qualified high-school seniors.

One hundred and ninety-nine or, 28.3 percent, of these 703 seniors made a percentile ranking, based on national norms, above 90; however the committee decided not to consider for scholarship, at this time, those students who had an average percentile ranking of 94 or below in the areas of mathematics and science, and an average percentile ranking of 90 or below in the areas of English and social studies. This eliminated 20 of the 199 students.

By process of further elimination according to pupil interest, course of study pursued, and a financial need formula; only 53 students, who were still qualified, remained.

A plan is being devised whereby those 53 students needing financial assistance may obtain this aid from private sources in Indiana. The committee is convinced that Federal assistance on this program is neither necessary nor desirable.

Mr. Speaker, what did Indiana do to meet this need? An effective antidote for the crippling disease of Federal aid to education is being offered by the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce. A large group of leading businessmen from all parts of the State have joined in creating its own scholarship-aid program. This has been done through the

establishment of a private foundation incorporated by 17 members which will give scholarships to supplement the resources of high-school graduates who wish to go to college. Pupils interested in science and mathematics will receive first attention.

In fact, the first set of scholarships will total 53 which immediately answers the need as disclosed by the study made under the direction of the Indiana State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

This principle proves that the tax burden that this bill would impose upon the people would be eliminated. By almost any criterion, the Indiana program measures up to a sounder and more logical way to aid needy young men and women. First of all, it will eliminate perhaps as much as 30 percent loss in the funds that would be absorbed by administrative costs as provided in the bill that is before us.

It is true that this program is tailored to meet the needs of Indiana but I repeat again that any State can do what Indiana is doing and they will be proud of the results.

To bring the problem closer home, I checked with the 5 colleges in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana and I received replies from all 5 presidents of these outstanding private colleges.

One of these college presidents reports in part as follows:

It is important that we avoid frustration by which we would turn our educational course in the direction of the material, but rather hold to a steady course in the total educational program which, I believe, has contributed to the strength of our Nation.

As you may be aware, I believe that the educational program can be better handled on the State level. Already the National Government has undertaken many things which might be better handled on the local level, and handled more efficiently.

Another one of these college presidents made a significant statement:

At our institution we need ever more financial support. However, it is questionable whether it ought to come from the Federal Government. The genius of our America is to be able to raise money to meet the emergencies across the land. This is an emergency but we believe funds ought to be raised from private sources.

Still another one of these presidents expressed his concern at any attempt to compete with the Russians by adopting their educational system:

I would be greatly concerned, however, if we were to attempt to compete with the Russians by adopting their educational system. I expect that their system is an effective one for a totalitarian country. I am convinced, however, that if we were to emphasize the sciences by undermining the humanities and social sciences, we would put our democracy in great jeopardy. It seems to me, therefore, that any undue amount of attention to encouraging people to enter the sciences may do more to create a problem for our Nation than it would do in providing a solution.

Another important reason that we should think twice before voting on this bill is due to the fact that we already have a staggering debt and a resultant inflationary process that is bowing the backs of the American taxpayers. The additional cost of \$1 billion to the tax-

payers could be the factor that starts another inflationary spiral that could mean financial ruin. If we really want to help, the loan idea might be a much better approach but I still do not consider it as an entirely satisfactory solution. Several of these college presidents suggested that a much better approach would be to give tax relief to the parents who are sending their young people to college or even to high school. In fact, there was considerable hope in the thoughts of a good many people that the present Congress would modify the tax laws so as to increase the incentives to give. The legislation that has been suggested and proposed would make a tax reduction that would help on tuition costs. I understand that bills were submitted that would propose a tax reduction for tuition payments up to 38 percent of the tuition bill or a maximum of \$500, whichever is greater. It would seem that this kind of legislation would be much more consistent with the American tradition than the regimented type of proposal offered in the bill that is before us today. It would give immediate financial help to parents who are hardest pressed in paying college bills and it would encourage an advance in tuition that would more nearly cover the cost of the educational program. We need assistance in many other ways than finances. The young people need and want guidance and I feel confident that they hunger for some of the old-fashioned principles of hard work, frugality, and a determination toward accomplishment by exercise of their own abilities. They need to be taught the American way of life and not the Communist Russian method.

Abraham Lincoln never went to college but he wrote the Gettysburg Address which hangs on a wall in Oxford University as an example of pure and perfect English. Lincoln even studied Euclid and probably knew more mathematics than many college graduates. Why did he do all of this? It was for the purpose of intellectual development and intellectual development must be the aim and objective of our American educational system.

Edison was reported to have said that it was not inspiration but perspiration that made it possible for him to make so many remarkable scientific discoveries.

We do not need to copy the Communist philosophy of regimentation and concentration of authority in the Federal Government. We must learn self-sufficiency and self-reliance and have a faith and belief in God instead of bowing meekly before an all powerful Federal Government. Let us stop Federal aid to education now before it is too late.

(Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, scholarships, to my way of thinking, are the least objectionable form of Federal aid to education and certainly no one can quarrel with the objectives of this so-called scholarship bill. Yet, as I will

explain, I felt impelled to vote against the rule and, in turn, intend to vote against the bill.

This is because I am deeply concerned at the extent of present nonessential Federal spending. I am fearful of runaway inflation, and I think the time has come when we must call a halt to new spending programs.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain economic fluctuations in values which offset the loss of the purchasing power of the dollar through inflation. For example, the cost of homes rises to some extent and so do commodity prices. But there is no means of absolute protection against this financial disease called inflation even for the rich. In the case of the workingman and the retired pensioner and low fixed-income groups, the result of inflation is tragic.

We have had limited inflation. However—and I hate to say this—I greatly fear, Mr. Chairman, we are headed into accelerated inflation on a scale heretofore unknown in America, and the sad part about this situation is we are deliberately speeding up this inflationary process by increased Federal spending and by embarking on new programs, meritorious though they may be, but ones involving vast expenditures.

We have seen the buying power of savings and life insurance during the last 20 years cut in half. We have seen the accumulated thrift and provision for retirement of those on pensions reduced to a level of 50 percent of their original value. Wages have gone up, but never have kept pace with the decreased buying power, and this has not been pleasant, but it was partly a result of war and world conditions and to a large extent inevitable. Since Korea, also, the Federal budget was within reasonable balance. High taxation siphoned off public income and the Government was on a more or less pay-as-you-go basis. Taxation was limited, in other words.

Then sputnik I went into orbit, and political if not public hysteria set in. As usual, money and more money was the politicians' answer to all problems. So now we face a Federal deficit of twelve to eighteen billion dollars next year, and where Government spending will go after that, no one can foretell except that the direction is up and up and up.

What does that mean? Well, for one thing, in my opinion, it means all-out inflation. It means if you own corporate stocks in firms where management can raise its prices to adjust for inflation, there will be increased profits. The wealthy will get more dividends—maybe no more buying power, but more dollars; probably less buying power, but it will be different for laborers, pensioners and those on fixed incomes. The property owner can raise rents and adjust to inflation. The farmer can raise prices to offset to some degree his increased expense. But no one will gain, and the working men and women and low-fixed income groups will be the real sufferers. Under existing conditions, I am fearful as never before as to impending inflation. Consumers' buying power is in danger. That threat is a threat to every American.

In February Congress recognized the increase in Federal spending for defense and other programs and increased by \$5 billion the public debt limit. I voted for that increase because in the debt management it would allow for flexibility and give the Secretary of the Treasury a means of obtaining lower interest rates on Government borrowing and thus result in economy.

But yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I could not bring myself to support another increase in the debt limit. I was one of the 108 "nays" opposing passage of H. R. 13580 to raise the limit from \$275 billion to \$285 billion and in addition a temporary \$3 billion increase to \$288 billion through June 30, 1960.

I know the Federal revenue is down from the \$72 billion to an estimated \$69 billion.

But to me the answer lies not in increasing the inflationary spiral but rather in eliminating some of the causes and voting down many unnecessary proposed new spending programs. Holding the line on the public debt would force the executive branch into an allocation and economy program on measures heretofore approved—would force spending slowdowns and eliminations by keeping the debt ceiling as it is.

Frankly, I see no alternative in combating inflation except by making it unlawful for the Federal Government to spend more.

The other day a \$2 billion community facilities bill was before us. I voted against it. Similar measures of one kind or another, but all entailing more and more spending are in the Rules Committee or on the way.

I shall vote against these other measures—and indeed many of them, like this scholarship bill, have meritorious intentions. But in all conscience, weighing their virtues against the deadly sin of larceny by process of inflation, I am left with no other course.

When the Congress adjourns I shall report this "no" vote to my constituents. I shall speak frankly. I shall say elect another in my place if you think me wrong. But I know what is right. The easy way today is to vote "aye" on this education bill.

But as for me, as I shall state to the people I represent, I have opposed an increase in the public debt and to justify that vote I had to likewise vote against the authorization of vast new programs which in turn would increase that public debt. I intend to be consistent.

I am voting today not against education as such, or scholarships to develop more scientists, if it will accomplish that, which I doubt. Rather my vote is against runaway inflation, wage and savings shrinkage, and fiscal irresponsibility.

I am doing what I think is proper, and if and when other billion-dollar new spending programs comes to the floor in these last days of this Congress, I shall vote against them. With ensuing bills with a total, as I understand, of more than \$6 billion, I shall do the same if they are considered here during this session.

That decision, and the decision on this \$1 billion scholarship bill which we are

now considering, was made when I voted against the debt limit. Again let me say, I do not treat the needs of education lightly, but the horror of runaway inflation is far more serious. So I am going to stand firmly and try desperately to protect the wages and income of the poor and needy and stave off national inflation and public ruin.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the President has his economists and inflation is not a new problem. But it may well be a more serious problem of its kind than at any time in the history of this Nation. I believe it is. I would hope that George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO and President Al Hays of the Machinists Union, and other able top representatives of the organized workers of America, would be asked to join with leaders of business such as the heads of the steel firms which just put into effect another price increase. Government alone cannot take the responsibility of curbing or solving inflation.

Congress gets plenty of advice as to how to spend moneys and establish and expand Government services; it is time for those same advisers to accept part of the responsibility of charting financial courses in line with defense needs and sound Federal finances. A suggestion of restraint in making demands is not enough. Government, labor, and business leaders must sit down and suggest what services and spending are essential and how we can fund our expenditures within the framework of reasonable taxation and maintenance of sound dollars in the paychecks of American working men and women.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern].

IMPROVED EDUCATION—A WISE INVESTMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, one of the most fortunate experiences that I have enjoyed in my first term as a Member of the 85th Congress has been my work under the leadership of the Education Subcommittee chairman, Congressman CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama. His patience, his kindness, and his thoroughness in the conduct of hearings and committee investigations have been an inspiration to all of us. I am pleased to follow his leadership on the important legislation before us today.

The great world historian, H. G. Wells, once observed:

Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.

This statement was made many years ago, but it speaks with even more compelling force to our own day. The challenge that confronts the schools of America today is far greater than the Russian sputnik. We are confronted by a world in ferment—a world convulsed by vast social and political revolutions which our young people must learn to understand. We are also living in an age of swiftly moving technological change.

The challenge that we face is a total one—a challenge in the fields of politics, economics, morality, science, and the arts.

It is regrettable that the launching of the Russian satellite led many of us to believe that a crash program in the pro-

duction of American scientists was our most urgent educational task.

My own view is that we do need more and better scientists, but we also desperately need more and better teachers, economists, journalists, clergymen, and, yes, politicians—in short, a better educated American citizenry.

As we reach out for the goal of a better educated people, we ought to concentrate our efforts on the most urgent aspects of the educational problem.

GOOD TEACHING THE HEART OF GOOD EDUCATION

It has always seemed to me that the heart of good education is the good teacher.

I was one of those who worked hard for the ill-fated school construction bill a year ago, but new classroom construction is not the most fundamental need of American education. Our most pressing need is for better trained students and teachers.

If I had to make a choice between sending my children to a beautiful school building staffed by poor, underpaid teachers or sending them to a shabby school that had superior, adequately paid teachers, I would quickly choose the latter course.

The great virtue of the legislation before us is that it seeks to elevate the quality of American education. It seeks better teaching and better scholarship on the part of our students.

SUMMARY OF HIGHLIGHTS OF BILL

It attempts these objectives by the following methods:

First. Establishing a limited program of Federal scholarships.

Second. Establishing loan programs for students at institutions of higher learning.

Third. Providing grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics and modern foreign language instruction in public schools.

Fourth. Establishing language institutes and area centers to expand and improve the teaching of languages.

Fifth. Assisting in the expansion of graduate education.

Sixth. Assisting in the improving of guidance, counseling, and testing programs.

Seventh. Providing for research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes.

Eighth. Improving statistical services of State educational agencies.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one point perfectly clear. This bill prohibits Federal control of education. It simply provides that the Federal Government has a responsibility to share with our local and State communities in the expansion and improvement of educational standards.

I should like to devote the balance of my remarks this afternoon to title VI of the bill which seeks to expand and strengthen graduate education.

TITLE VI—GRADUATE EDUCATION

Title VI would provide for the award of graduate fellowships to individuals selected by colleges and universities who, as part of the institution's program for expanding graduate education, would work toward the doctorate degree with

the purpose of making a career in college teaching. The purpose of the program which this title would authorize would be to increase the number of fully qualified college faculty members.

I can speak of the need for such assistance in terms of intimate personal knowledge of the problem. The known facts as to our pressing needs for college teachers, however, speak eloquently for themselves. Our colleges and universities must, in the next few years, expand to accommodate students far beyond their present numbers. They will require, therefore, greatly increased numbers of faculty.

Conservative estimates indicate that between 15,000 and 22,000 new college teachers must be recruited annually during the next decade. The problem involved can best be understood when we realize that the doctoral degree represents the desirable and standard preparation for teaching in college. Today there are only some 163 institutions out of a national total of 1,856 that confer earned doctoral degrees. Each year, about 9,000 persons receive the doctoral degree, of which only about 5,000 enter college teaching as a career. Some of these 5,000 have already been teaching in colleges while working for the degree.

The above analysis places the problem we face in perspective. There are only two alternatives open to higher education in this situation—expand graduate education to produce more fully-qualified faculty members or face a further and sharp decline in the quality of higher education.

I use the term "further decline" advisedly, because the decline in quality has already commenced. In 1953-54, 40 percent of all college teachers held the doctoral degree, but in this same year only 31 percent of the new college teachers had such degrees. By 1957 the latter figure had dropped to 23 percent. This represents a serious loss indeed.

This deterioration in preparation is felt most severely in the fields of science, mathematics, and engineering. In these disciplines, the percentages of new full-time college teachers with the doctorate declined in 3 years by 40 percent and 30 percent, respectively.

Also, the number of well-trained persons who are potential college teachers is eroded away and drained off into other fields of work. The shrinkage is worse in some fields than in others. In chemistry about 3 of every 4 persons holding the doctorate enter noneducational occupations, in engineering it is 3 out of 4, and in physics 3 out of 5. Industry, which prizes the fine talent assembled in our colleges and universities, is able to offer higher salaries than the colleges can pay, and therefore it skims much of the cream of academic scholarship, taking not only the promising young scholars but their professors as well.

Many of the graduate schools have few students because the schools do not have the resources to instruct larger numbers. Graduate education is costly. It requires extensive and costly library and laboratory facilities. The direction of graduate students is largely on an individual basis, which means that the ratio of teachers to students is neces-

sarily high. Moreover, many graduate students have families for whom living accommodations must be made available. This heavy cost limits the number of universities that can offer acceptable opportunities for graduate study.

Consequently, today there are only some 163 institutions out of a national total of 1,856 that confer doctoral degrees based on graduate instruction. Sixty-nine of these are under public control and 94 are under private control. In the year 1955-56, 60 institutions each conferred fewer than 10 doctoral degrees, and 103 conferred 10 or more. Only a few—27, to be exact—awarded more than 100 such degrees. It appears, therefore, that a considerable potential exists for increasing the output of our graduate schools. The provisions of this title offer an effective means by which this may be accomplished. It is an important, integral part of this well-conceived bill. It is in the national interest for us to enact it.

Mr. Chairman, some time ago I set forth some of my views on education in a newsletter to my South Dakota constituents. The editor of the South Dakota Education Association Journal saw fit to include my newsletter in the Journal of April 1958. I include the newsletter at this point in the RECORD:

THE PROBLEM AS I SEE IT

(By Congressman GEORGE MCGOVERN)

Since the earliest days on the American frontier, education has been dear to the hearts of the American people. Within 6 years of the landing of the Puritans at Massachusetts Bay, Harvard University opened its doors. As the line of settlement moved westward, the settlers were quick to establish schools and colleges. Believing that religion and education were the twin foundations of good government, they were willing to make whatever sacrifice was necessary to build good schools and churches.

EDUCATION AND THE AMERICAN TRADITION

As early as 1785, the American Government provided for the ceding of the 16th section of every township in the public domain for educational purposes. Two years later, the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 stated: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

The founding fathers agreed on the need for national support of the schools. In his first message to Congress, Washington said: "There is nothing more deserving your patronage than the promotion of science and literature." Alexander Hamilton, the brilliant first Secretary of the Treasury, declared that "Whatever concerns the general interests of learning * * * are within the sphere of the national councils, as far as regards an application of money." Said Thomas Jefferson: "I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people."

UNITED STATES SCHOOLS ON TRIAL TODAY

Jefferson and his colleagues knew that democracy could not succeed unless the people were educated. Today, the complex demands of our fast-shrinking globe have placed vast new responsibilities on the teachers, students, and classrooms of America. Russian missile developments have led many people to believe that United States schools must point their efforts to science and mathematics. My own view is that we do need better science education, but we

also need to strengthen our entire academic program across the board. We need to learn our history lessons better, improve our use of languages and our understanding of human relations. It is fine to talk about accelerating science, but if we are to live with these awesome creations of science, we must accelerate our understanding of those social, political, and moral forces that will determine whether science is a blessing or the means of our destruction.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO EDUCATION

With our school population expanding at an unbelievable rate at the same time that the cost of operation is mounting steadily, school districts in all parts of the Nation are discovering that the traditional property tax base is simply not adequate to cover the cost of education.

In South Dakota, many school districts have reached the maximum mill levy allowed by law and are still incapable of supporting adequate teacher salaries and necessary school equipment and facilities. As the owner of a modest house in my hometown, I can verify from personal experience the heavy property tax load which my fellow South Dakotans are already carrying. I do not see how we can support needed school expansion purely by further increases in the local tax loads.

It is the income tax that reflects the increased national income of the American people, but this source of revenue has been largely taken by the Federal Government. That is why many people have come to feel that the Federal Government should return a portion of the income tax collections to the States for educational purposes.

SCHOOL AID BILL

I am joining my colleagues on the House Education and Labor Committee in support of a Federal assistance program for education. Such a program has been urged by President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, and former President Truman. Program supporters are determined, however, that it must carry careful safeguards to prevent the Federal Government from interfering with local school direction.

I am ready to introduce legislation specifically drafted to provide modest Federal educational grants to the States with no strings attached. The money would be apportioned to State education departments on a population basis, then disbursed to local school districts for use under local school board direction. My bill also calls for college scholarships and loans to worthy students.

I welcome your suggestions and questions on this vital subject of education.

THE LATE SENATOR TAFT SUPPORTED FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, the late Senator Taft led the fight for Federal assistance to the schools 10 years ago. The Senator lost that fight, but his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1948, are cogent yet today. I include at this point excerpts from Senator Taft's floor remarks:

ROBERT TAFT ON EDUCATION, MARCH 24, 1948

Four years ago, I opposed the bill on this subject; but in the course of that debate it became so apparent that many children in the United States were left without education, and then it became apparent upon further study, that that was not the fault, necessarily, of the States where they lived, but rather the financial abilities of the States, that I could see no way of meeting the condition which now exists regarding illiteracy in the United States and lack of education in the United States without some Federal assistance, particularly for those States which today are considerably below the average wealth of the United States (p. 3438).

I do not think I can exaggerate the necessity of education. Primary education lies at the basis of all forms of republican government. A government depending on the making of decisions by the people and depending on their intelligence can exist only if the people have some ability to understand the problems of government which are presented to them. Unless there is a satisfactory educational basis, there cannot possibly be hope for success in any democratic form of government where the people are expected to rule and to decide the questions which are placed before them (p. 3439).

Fundamentally, Mr. President, I think we have a tremendous obligation to provide equality of opportunity to the children of the United States. * * * No child can have equality of opportunity, in my opinion, unless to start with he has a basic minimum education (p. 3439).

I have drawn always a strong distinction between the Federal Government interfering to regulate the people of the States to take over the business of State and local governments and extending its power that way, and the Federal Government assisting the States. * * * I have not been able to find that the Congress of the United States, when appealed to on a major question, is prepared to refuse to act. If we should have unemployment to the extent that relief is required, and people should come here asking for aid, we could not refuse them. It may be constitutional, but it is not practical, when people say, "Here is a health situation beyond the power of our locality," to reply, "That is not our field. You do it." It might be possible to make a logical argument in that connection. I tried to make such an argument, for a while, when I first came to the Senate. It appealed to no one. The people were not satisfied. They said, "You have the money; you can help. You cannot stand behind the Constitution and say you are not going to do it. You must do it" (p. 3441).

In matters affecting the necessities of life—and I should like to confine it so far as possible to the necessities of life; namely, to relief, to education, to health, and to housing—I do not believe the Federal Government can say it has no interest, and say to the people, "Go your way and do the best you can." I do not believe we should do that. Because of the way wealth is distributed in the United States I think we have a responsibility to see if we cannot eliminate hardship, poverty, and inequality of opportunity, to the best of our ability. I do not believe we are able to do it without a Federal aid system (p. 3441).

It is popular to provide for public works. * * * Public works are nice things; we can see them. But when it comes down to the basic necessities of life and the basic elements of human welfare and human progress, there is nothing more important than education. It does not have the glamour that other things have, but it seems to me we must go forward in the field of education for our people and I know of no way of going forward in that field to any substantial degree without providing some Federal financial assistance (p. 3466).

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 13247. I believe this bill is meritorious and needed. In addition to the scholarship program provided for by this measure, this bill provides grants to the States to assist over a period of 4 fiscal years in establishing and maintaining a 2-part program for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools. These grants amount to

\$65 million per year. Through this assistance, many smaller schools will be able to provide adequate training in these important fields, although these smaller schools, in many cases, have not been able to do so up until this time. It is my feeling that students should have this training made available to them, whether they attend large or small schools, and whether they live in wealthy school districts or in poor school districts. I urge the adoption of H. R. 13247.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, the need for much of what is in this Defense Education Bill is a tragic commentary on the people of this country and our educational administration. If the bill is properly amended, I shall feel obliged to vote for it because of the educational neglects in our country.

I say the need for much of this is tragic. It is tragic because it represents lack of responsibility on the State and local level. It represents lack of responsibility on the part of those engaged in private enterprise. It represents poor judgment and administration on the part of some educators.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is more tragic because it, together with other legislation, reflects a concept of Government in this country that is growing at an alarming rate. Do the people of this country and their representatives really believe that the freedom we enjoy is merely the result of our noble character and love of freedom? I insist that our freedom is the result of our form of government. Part of that form, which we have more by good fortune than good management, is the system of sovereign States under a Federal Government of limited powers. The growing tendency of our people to rely on the Federal Treasury, the attitudes of our politicians and our courts is destroying this part of our form of government. As one authority recently put it, we are ignoring the "grand design" of our Constitution.

This destruction is, of course, the very purpose of the Democrat-Socialists—European variety—whose political leadership is very strong in many large and influential organizations. It is their purpose because they know that socialism cannot function under a system of sovereign states organized under a national government of limited powers.

Why do I dwell on this subject during debate on the bill providing funds for education? If it is not obvious, may I say it is in the rather forlorn hope that we can keep this a 4-year program; that we may in some small measure reawaken ourselves to the necessity for assuming responsibility through local and private initiative if we are going to preserve our grand system which has given us the freedom we enjoy.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the rule; I am going to vote against the bill. I do not think that Federal aid should be any part of our educational system. I do not want the Government interfering with an educational system that has turned in a magnificent performance over the past 100 years.

Yesterday I could get but half a minute, so I am reiterating what I said previously of these Federal aid to education programs.

I am opposed to the Federal Government's intervening in any part of our educational system, and the Members will change their opinions and thinking when the Government goes into their respective areas to tell them what to do, how to do it, when to do it, and what to do.

Local responsibility and local self-government are the keystones of our American way of life. Federal aid is always accompanied by a greater or lesser degree of Federal control. It is the opening wedge toward having the directors in Washington tell the local school boards, superintendents, principals, and teachers what they can do and what they cannot do.

I believe that the citizens in every community should take a good hard look and interest themselves in their local school systems.

There are, it is true, as I have already stated, many problems to solve; however, these school problems can best be solved at local and State levels and not by this program or any other program of Federal aid to our educational system.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I know of no one on the floor of the House more deeply interested in national defense than the gentleman from Pennsylvania now addressing us. Can he tell us if there is any place in this bill where he finds that national defense will be helped by this program?

Mr. GAVIN. Not to my knowledge, I may say to my very able colleague from New York.

A large part of the problem we have today is one of self-discipline on the part of the Government and on the part of the American people themselves. The Government within the executive branch must make a constant effort to curtail and eliminate non-essential expenditures. Now I want to call to the attention of the Committee and of the gentleman from West Virginia: That it is special groups who are responsible for the push behind these Federal aid programs, rather than popular demand from back home. You have not been hearing from the folks back home relative to these scholarship programs. You have been hearing from the special interests.

I want to call to the attention of the House, that Federal aid programs such as we are considering today are based on the fallacy that Uncle Sam is everybody's rich uncle—and this I have stated to the House many times—whose pockets are seemingly inexhaustible; and that when you secure Federal aid, regardless

of what it may be for, you are receiving something for nothing.

Why fool ourselves? We all pay the bill. The truth is that all his nephews and nieces support Uncle Sam, who over the past 25 years has run up the biggest debt in all our history, approximately \$275 billion that must be paid—if it is ever paid—by the American people earning the money to pay the taxes to retire the debt. What a legacy to leave to future generations.

If we paid it off—as I have stated on other occasions before the House—at the rate of \$3 billion a year, it would take 90 to 100 years to pay the debt.

And just this week we increased the debt limitation to \$288 billion and we are facing in fiscal year 1959 a deficit of approximately \$10 to \$12 billion. The trouble is that Uncle Sam has been spending our money and in effect we have signed the notes for the hundreds of billions of dollars he owes. The surest way to increase his debts and add to this gigantic debt is to embark on a new program of Federal aid for educational purposes.

Regardless of the debt, I am opposed to the Federal Government getting into any part of our educational system.

The great American public awakened to the fact that the only way to get relief from the taxes that burden our Nation is to curb our spending for programs that can be better handled by municipalities and the respective states. Every Member of this House knows that it would be better to leave our educational programs in the hands of the municipalities, counties and states.

Every dollar spent on Federal aid programs will come, sooner or later, from the pockets of the American taxpayers whether it is under the supervision of the Federal or the State Government. As for me, I would rather have the States handling any and all educational programs.

Now I might point out to the House, as in the case of every other Federal aid program, many of these dollars will be skimmed off the top to pay more Federal officials to distribute the payments, to administer the program, to think up more rules and regulations which may well result in more delay and redtape.

It is the habit of Federal supervisors to make dollars shrink instead of stretch, and if there is ever a necessity for stretching dollars, it exists now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I shall confine my remarks to title 5 of this bill, the language development section. In all conscience there is probably no section of the bill which would be entitled to more universal support than this section.

Perhaps, to make it dramatic, I believe that I could at this moment ask the question whether there is a single Member of the House present at this time who would feel that he was qualified to act as an interpreter for the President of

the United States at a summit meeting to be held with Mr. Khrushchev. I do not think there is anybody here who speaks Russian fluently enough to qualify, although I am told there is possibly one Member who does.

Mr. Chairman, I think the important thing to point out is that this is not anything unusual. We are simply a representative body of the people of America who for many years did not feel the necessity of studying foreign languages. Today, of course, the situation is entirely different. We have voted for foreign programs, including national defense programs, where we have set up bases in foreign countries. In order to have them properly function, we should have both men and women who are able to speak the language of that area. We are also going through a development in the world's history where, as in Africa or in Asia or in India, nations are arising that speak languages which were never heard of in previous times. Therefore, this bill appropriates the almost very negligible amount of \$4.5 million to basically encourage the beginning of institutes and language centers where these languages may be studied, where qualified teachers may be trained in order to make sure that the languages are properly taught in this country.

The need for improved programs of foreign language training is apparent when we look at the present responsibilities the Nation is facing. About 3 million Americans are listed as living, traveling, or working overseas. Few Americans available for overseas assignments have had any foreign language training. On the basis of the latest available data, less than 15 percent of the public high-school population was studying any foreign language. It is estimated that no more than 15 percent of the 3 million students in our colleges are studying any modern foreign language. Most Americans who have been studying a foreign language start too late and stop too soon to become proficient in the use of the language.

America can scarcely afford to let this situation continue. The U. S. S. R. is moving ahead rapidly in language instruction, and its emissaries to foreign nations are able to speak the languages of those nations. This is a marked contrast with the competence of most Americans in similar situations.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of foreign languages that are spoken today by millions of people, such as Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Persian, Indonesian, and Swahili, yet these languages are taught in only a very few centers in the United States. Today there are probably not more than 25 institutions of higher education in the Nation that are suitable for the establishment of either foreign language institutes or foreign language area studies centers.

Language instruction in our schools and colleges is so badly neglected that we do not even have enough people who are proficient in French, Spanish, and German to meet the requirements of our international affairs. Recently the Department of State found that only 25 percent of their incoming foreign service

officers had a working knowledge of any foreign language. There is a need to extend the length of language study sequences in both the schools and colleges to insure that serious students of a language achieve a reasonably proficient speaking knowledge.

If we are to establish the most effective working relationships with foreign nations, our representatives must be able to speak to them in their own language. We are often subject to serious misunderstandings, and sometimes to outright deception, when we find it necessary to use interpreters in our dealings with foreign peoples. Often we are represented as if we were a Colonial power by the people of a Nation when we force them to speak to us in our language because we do not know theirs. The Russians know this and are putting tremendous emphasis upon foreign language proficiency for their nationals who are likely to have working relationships with foreign nationals either abroad or in Russia.

The Russians require all students in their 10-year schools to study a foreign language for 6 years. They have special language schools, as well, in which instruction in the upper grades is conducted entirely in a foreign language. Forty percent of the students in Russian secondary schools and 60 percent of Russian university students study English. Language in Russia is recognized as an important tool in foreign policy.

Foreign language competence is now a matter of high priority in the national interest. The Federal Government has a legitimate interest in stimulating activity to meet this critical national need. The Federal participation proposed in this bill is on an extremely modest scale, but it could provide concrete leadership and evident interest on the part of the Federal Government.

Only 1.4 percent of the 1957 college graduates who were qualified to teach majored in a foreign language. This was the lowest percent of 1957 college graduates in any major field of study. A large percentage of our foreign-language teachers are part-time teachers of a language and have only a minor or less preparation in the language they teach.

The language and area study centers for the study of languages rarely if ever taught in this country, and for the preparation of teachers and others who will use these languages in the public service, are of particular importance. The fast-moving events of the last few years have dramatically—often, for us, tragically—revealed the emergence of the peoples of Africa and Asia into the centers of world power. Yet for the most part we know nothing of their languages and all too little of their cultures.

Our Government is already spending large sums of money in trying to do in its own installations those things in the field of languages and area studies which can only be done in our schools and colleges. This title of the bill is a step toward getting the Federal Government out of such operations and returning the job to the schools and colleges where it can best be done.

As important as anything else, into these countries we want to send Americans who are going to win goodwill for democracy and freedom, where they will have a knowledge of the people, where they will have knowledge of the background of those areas.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that if there is nothing else in this bill of great value, certainly this title 5, the language development section, deserves the complete support of each and every one of us here today in our national defense effort and in the effort to bring freedom to the world.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. WALTER. What arrangements have been made for the teaching of these languages that are not ordinarily taught?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The bill makes provision, if the gentleman will refer to it beginning at page 32, for the implementation of language institutes in higher educational institutions where these languages will, by the help of the Commissioner of Education, be developed under the national needs of the country. In other words, the Commissioner of Education will give that information to these institutes throughout the country, or institutions, which will be capable of developing this program.

Mr. WALTER. What assurances are there that any institution will undertake to change its curriculum?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Of course, there are no assurances, and if actually no one came forward the Commissioner would not disburse the \$4.5 million which is here authorized. But if the Commissioner is successful in pointing out to these institutions the need of the country, I am sure that we have in this country already educational institutions which will rise to meet the needs of the country. There are in existence now organizations of qualified people, both teachers and others, who stand ready to help the Commissioner.

I think the distinguished gentleman knows full well that the Department of State itself since 1954 has had to eliminate the provision that if you want to take an examination for the Foreign Service you had to be able to speak at least one foreign language. That has had to be wiped out because they could not get qualified candidates.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I testified before this committee at some length suggesting areas where education could be helped, in my opinion. I discussed various ways how I thought it could be helped through income-tax credits, through loan funds, through review of the military impact on our educational system with proper areas for reform. This bill hardly meets these suggestions. It has a couple of elements that I think are desirable, but unless it is modified and amended in a radical way I shall oppose it.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, let us proceed first to this question, Wherein will the bill aid national defense? I would like to say in the first place that the soldiers of today and of the future are not the musket-carrying variety. They are the soldiers of the slide rule. These soldiers can be produced only in our colleges. Therein is where this bill provides for national defense.

This bill helps equip scientific laboratories in the high school. We desperately need better equipped labs; we all know that. This bill gives scholarships to the soldiers of the slide rule.

Half of the brightest students cannot even attend college right now. Only 66 percent of the brightest 2 percent of our youth are in college. For every 25 of the brightest high-school graduates there is only 1 who ever gets to a doctor of philosophy degree. We are not going to win this race for scientific supremacy at that rate. I am surprised that the dramatic lesson of the sputnik has not sunk more deeply into our systems with regard to where this bill will help our defense activities.

Now let us go to the section on modern languages. You know our difficulty there. We do not know the languages of foreign peoples. They think we are apart from them. They do not think we are one of them partly because we cannot communicate with them. We must have more study of foreign languages if we are to have people-to-people contacts. I have less faith in contacts through the leadership of the various countries than I do through the people-to-people contacts.

With regard to need, with this amendment which the committee will offer, the scholarships are given on the basis of financial need. The State commissions will select the scholarship people. Those commissions of school men are fine, honorable, reliable people. They are not your wastrels. They are men you can depend upon to be fair and frugal.

I wish, now, to dwell on the need for fellowships. A fellowship is given to men or women who will work for what they get. This fellow will teach a class, he will be a laboratory assistant, he will correct papers, he will lengthen the arms of our overworked teachers, who cannot do a good job now because they have too many classes and too many students. Those fellowship students will give a tremendous boost to the efficiency of our schools.

These fellowship students get practice in teaching, just one class this year, maybe two classes next year, and many will turn out to be college teachers. If we do not build buildings and train teachers, and you cannot train teachers as fast as you can build buildings, at a faster rate than we are now, by 1970 1 out of every 3 of the top high school graduates will never get into our colleges. We must have more college teachers. These fellows, where they work for what they get, will become the

college teachers of tomorrow, they will become the soldiers of the slide rule.

This title VI is so extremely important. Let us not let the little qualms we have about section 2, as to the scholarships, which is a minor feature of the whole measure kill the eight other provisions that are wonderful, and against which these objections cannot be levied.

You cannot tell me we do not need much Federal encouragement and some assistance. I spent 3 months visiting 25 high schools. I obtained a competent research worker to gather statistics. He found that of 25 high schools studied, 82.8 percent of the top quarter of these graduates in our State went to college. We followed them in college, and found that a third of them had to quit for financial reasons. A third of those who entered could not get through college.

I sat down with 25 of those high-school principals and with scores of those high-school graduates who were going into college, and I sat down with scores of them who were in college. I know their problems.

Let us not let what qualms we have about this section 2 on scholarships, which is now cut down and restricted to those students in financial need, cause us to kill this wonderful bill with its 8 other fine provisions.

(Mr. DOOLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Utah for yielding to me. And I want to commend him earnestly for the contribution he has made to what I hope will result in the successful enactment of this very important piece of legislation.

Never before in history has the fact been so poignantly evident that our Nation lacks students who are familiar with certain foreign languages and skilled in the scientific knowledge of this space-minded age. Recently it came to my attention that the Department of State had to drop as one of its requirements for the Foreign Service proficiency in a foreign language by an applicant. This is a sad commentary on our educational system.

Currently new nations are emerging into world prominence. Some of them speak in tongues virtually unknown in this country. It is important that our country—if it is to continue its role of world leadership, should produce its share of men and women fluent in these languages.

As for the claim that this measure opens the door for Government interference in our educational system, may I point out that for years the Government has contributed substantially to medical and vocational education, to land-grant colleges, to the school-lunch program, and has yet to be accused of exerting undue influence on educators or education.

I opposed the school-construction bill last year, but this is a measure of a different kind. This bill will do a needed service and I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my colleagues of the committee on the excellent job they have done. They have my complete support. However, there are 3 amendments I will propose on the floor during debate.

These three amendments are similar. They are aimed at abolishing all forms of discrimination wherever they may come up. They will be presented to title II, on scholarships, title III, on loans to students, and title VI, on fellowships for graduate education.

The amendments will bar discrimination based on race, color, national origin, religion, or sex.

The reasons for "race and color" will be to abolish all discrimination against Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Japanese-Americans, and the American Indians.

"Religion," I have inserted because there are certain areas of our country, unfortunately, which do discriminate because of religion, especially against Roman Catholics.

As to "National origin": One of our great scientists came from abroad. He was Enrico Fermi from Italy. We need to use our foreign born.

"Sex": Because here there seems to be a blind spot. I noticed in the debate that scientists and engineers are referred to as "young men" as if the field of science and engineering was for men only. Women have as much right as men to participate in this program.

Mr. Chairman, there is no need for anyone to use these antidiscrimination amendments as pegs to hang their hat on as a means of killing this bill. The House has voted for these amendments in the past including the Federal school-lunch program, which amendment was proposed by me. It was passed by the other body unanimously. It was known as the Powell antidiscrimination amendment. And today is the law of the land.

Mr. Chairman, finally I would like to say we are face to face with an Armageddon of ideas. War on a world basis is going through a period of obsolescence. What a tragedy it would be if the worst idea in the world that man has ever conceived, the idea of communism, would triumph over the best political idea that man has ever conceived—the idea of democracy, because we failed to put that idea into practice. Ideas are only valid to the degree that we practice them, that we remove them from out of the realm of the conjectural into the realm of the actual.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I want to thank my colleague when I was ill last year in the Navy hospital for presenting the Powell amendment which passed the House. This is an antidiscrimination amendment.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. That is the very point that I would like to have made clear to the membership. The amendments as proposed by the gentleman

from New York [Mr. POWELL] is not last year's Powell amendment which I introduced. It is an amendment that is already in seven existing laws such as the school-lunch program the Hill-Burton hospital program and many other pieces of legislation. Frankly, I am not sure that it is necessary. It just adds certain safeguards which are already in the Constitution of the United States, and I shall certainly support the amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I would like simply to say that I think a majority of the members of our committee have recognized that there is inherent in this bill just exactly what the gentleman has said. It must apply to everybody. There must be that universal application.

Mr. POWELL. The total brain power of the Nation must be marshaled.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Exactly. I think the amendments of the gentleman certainly are in order and we must emphasize these principles. Certainly, in the times in which we live and in the world today, it is well for us to hoist the flag of equality of opportunity for all because we are being attacked at every level for our failure to practice that principle.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I favor a sound educational program and recognize the defense implications of such a program as much as any other Member of this body. As a matter of fact, I have a deep personal interest in the subject of the bill before us today. Two of my children are attending public schools in Indiana. The third is about to enter college. I want my children and all the other children in the country to have the best education we can provide for them. I have approached this bill with their interests and the interests of other young people at heart and with a real concern for the defense and future of our country.

I expect to pick up the Washington Post tomorrow and read where I and those of my colleagues who oppose this bill are against children, against national defense, against teachers, against laboratories, against college education and so on. This, of course, is just not so. It is very logical to favor all these good objectives and still oppose this bill.

I cannot vote for this bill, because it does not stand up under careful examination. I cannot be for it, because the facts do not justify it. I cannot support it because much of it is unnecessary.

My record in the area of education has been one of unashamed conservatism coupled with careful concern for constructive evolution in this field. Wherever the States have demonstrated their ability to handle educational programs, I have felt it a duty to protect the

interests of local and State governments against the encroachment of a bankrupt Federal Government seeking to use its unlimited borrowing power as a cudgel to impose Federal control of the school systems it subsidizes.

This morning I hurriedly ran through my official voting record for the 7½ years I have been in Congress to check on my votes for education. I may possibly have missed extracting one or two, but the overall tally, as I found it, looked like this:

In the 82d Congress, I voted for assistance to schools in impacted defense areas. I voted against a National Advisory Committee in the 83d Congress because I felt this was a move to centralize control of our schools. I voted for the White House conference in the 83d Congress and for the bill authorizing cooperative research in education with our State institutions. In the 84th Congress, I voted for the rule to grant consideration of the school construction bill. After hearing the story, I voted against passage of the bill. The school construction bill came up again in the first session of the present Congress, and I voted to strike out the enacting clause, thus killing the bill. We won by only five votes. This is a record of conservatism but not of opposition to education.

Let us take a close look at the bill we are debating today. It is known as the National Defense Education Act of 1958. That is a very impressive title reminiscent of the sputnik scare. It is Federal aid to education dressed up in a bright new uniform with medals and venetian blind cord. Some refer to it glibly as the Federal scholarship bill, another glib attempt to create a palatable name for H. R. 13247. This, of course, is not accurate nomenclature, for only one of the bill's nine sections deals with scholarships, and amendments are already being discussed which would turn these outright grants into loans, essentially removing the scholarship feature. Of the bill as it stands, only \$189 million of the total \$840 million goes for scholarships.

The proponents of this bill really seek to assure us, "You can have Federal aid to education without Federal controls if you just use hyphenated aid instead of taking the whole educational system into the plan at once." This is just a new piecemeal version of the old big-money Federal-aid-to-education bill. It starts with 10,000 scholarships today. The chairman of the subcommittee states that 2 million students will apply for these 10,000 scholarships. How long do you think it will be before the proponents of this bill come back to us asking for another 10,000 scholarships, and another 10,000, and another 10,000? Let us answer a resounding no, today, and get the camel's nose out from under the tent.

Federal aid to education which, today, shows up on the floor of the House in a space suit will appear tomorrow in a surgeon's gown, next year in a professor's robes, and the year after that in an engineer's tweed suit. There is no end to the disguises available and likewise no end to the spending possibilities of this masquerade. The taxpayers are not amused.

The bill before us, in addition to carrying with it the seeds of Federal controls, calls for an expenditure of \$840 million over the next 4 years.

In addition to handing out the \$189 million in scholarships and \$220 million in loans, the bill grants direct Federal aid to public schools for science, mathematics, and foreign languages to the tune of \$260 million during the next 4 years.

It provides for "language development" institutes for our teachers and includes a travel allowance for them and their dependents to and from the institutes, at a cost to the taxpayer of \$13.6 million in the next 4 years.

The committee estimates that \$8 million will be necessary to conduct an investigation of television, radio, and motion pictures for educational purposes during this period.

And the bill calls for \$6.5 million to improve the statistical services of our State educational agencies. It also is important to note that the cost of Federal administration of the program during the first year will reach more than \$3 million.

Remember, only Congress can authorize or appropriate the spending of a cent of taxpayers' money.

This Democratic-controlled Congress seems destined to go down in history as the most lavish-spending Congress ever foisted on this unsuspecting country. It has unhesitatingly volunteered to cure every problem of local, State, and National importance with the one panacea at its command: printing-press money. Using our national debt as collateral, Congress intends the Federal Government to borrow against the working lives of our children and grandchildren to obtain money to force on solvent States for luxuries the States are unwilling to buy from their own pockets and for necessities they have been providing adequately for their citizens up to now.

The day before yesterday we were asked to mortgage another few months of our children's lives when we raised the debt ceiling. Although I voted against this measure, I recognized that the ceiling had to be raised—had to be increased because this Democratic-controlled House of Representatives and the other body had already spent more money this year than there is any prospect of the Federal Government taking in.

I was doubly glad I voted against raising the debt limit when I read *The Periscope* in the August 4 *Newsweek* magazine, which says:

That \$10 billion to \$12 billion deficit guess for fiscal 1959 is being quietly laid aside. The administration won't say so publicly, because it is trying to get Congress to vote approval of a big (\$8 billion) increase in the Federal debt limit. But, privately, officials concede that economic recovery has proceeded fast enough to make earlier deficit fears outdated. This will still be a year of substantial red-ink operations, of course. But the old figures were based on fear that full employment wouldn't return until 1960. Best guess now: Full employment by some time in calendar 1959, with a deficit of about \$5 billion for fiscal 1959.

By increasing the national debt limit the amount it did, the Congress is open-

ing the floodgates to more frivolous spending, if this *Newsweek* report is borne out by future economic events. This bill and much of the conglomerate calendar before us are sad examples.

The bill before us today is a do-it-yourself job, handmade by a Democratic-controlled committee, which is attempting to palm it off on the taxpaying public as a necessity. Who really asked for this bill? Not the students who have available scholarships and loan funds already established at colleges and universities which have gone unused in years past.

Recent scientific studies indicate that it is a lack of motivation, not of money, that causes most of the discontinuation of education by high-ability youth. A large number of university and college leaders appeared before the committee to testify that Federal scholarships are unnecessary and undesirable. The Association of American Colleges at its annual meeting rejected a resolution for Federal scholarships. It is wishful thinking on the part of Congress to assume the problem is this simply solved.

The Indiana State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wilbur Young, appointed a 14-member study committee to get the facts of the scholarship situation in Indiana. The committee sent a questionnaire to the 707 high school principals in Indiana to find out how many senior students with the interest, ability, and aptitude in science and mathematics to perform college work successfully would be unable to attend college because of lack of finances. The principals submitted estimates totaling 2,000.

When these 2,000 students were invited to take a 4½-hour examination in science, mathematics, English, and social studies, with a view to obtaining a scholarship, only 703—35 percent of the total—took the examination. This indicated that the other 65 percent included some who do not need financial assistance, others who do not care to go to college, and some who do not, themselves, feel qualified or eager for such a life.

Results of the 703 examination papers showed 179 students as having definite ability to successfully pursue a college course. These 179 were questioned as to their ability to finance their higher education. No replies were received from 23, and it was assumed they do not need financial aid. Fourteen said they had the necessary funds to attend the college of their choice for at least a year. Another 25 said they were not interested in science or mathematics as courses in higher education. Should we force them to adopt these careers by studiously copying, in this legislation, the Soviet approach to scholarships?

A standard need formula was then applied to the remaining 117 students. Sixty-four were eliminated by the formula, leaving 53 qualifying for aid in amounts from \$10 to \$1,200. Of the 53 qualifying for financial aid, 37 already had scholarships ranging from \$25 to \$750, but still needed some assistance.

The Indiana State Chamber of Commerce has undertaken the job of making sure these 53 students receive the assistance they need by creating its own scholarship-aid program. A local problem is thus solved on the local level by solvent local people, not debt-ridden big government.

The need was pointed out, and the people of Indiana were quick to respond, with a citizen program of their own, to solve the problem without coming hat in hand to Washington. The Indianapolis *News* recently editorialized on Hoosier self-reliance in meeting its student needs:

ANTIDOTE TO FEDERAL AID

The Senate Labor Committee, which approved a \$1,500,000,000 Federal aid to education bill—partly for college scholarships—should have looked first to Indiana.

An effective antidote for the creeping disease of Federal aid to education is being offered by the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce. This group of leading businessmen from all parts of the State has created its own scholarship-aid program.

It has been done through establishment of a private foundation incorporated by 17 members which will give scholarships to supplement the resources of high-school graduates who wish to go to college. Pupils interested in science and mathematics will receive first attention.

By almost any criterion, the State chamber's program measures up to a sounder and more logical way to aid needy young men and women.

In the matter of economics alone, it is far superior to any Federal program which would be financed entirely from the taxpayers' money, with a loss of about 30 percent in administrative costs.

The State chamber's plan is tailored to the need of Indiana, something that would be impossible in any Federal scholarship program operated by bureaucrats on the remote Potomac.

The private foundation will aid needy pupils in a list selected by a committee appointed by Governor Handley which had made a painstaking survey. It should be pointed out that the survey found that the need was far less acute than had been dramatized by overzealous advocates of Federal aid.

We believe it is significant that industrial and business leaders in Indiana are accepting their responsibilities toward higher education.

It is gratifying that the State chamber of commerce has taken its positive action. As long as there is such leadership in the cause of higher education there will be no reason at all for the meddling hand of Federal bureaucracy to reach into our schools and colleges.

The bill has not received full Senate approval yet. We hope that it never does, for we have a better way in Indiana.

In yesterday's *Washington Daily News* there was an editorial representing the position of the Scripps-Howard newspapers which undoubtedly appeared in the Indianapolis *Times* today. It points out the Federal Government's sizable payments in the field of education right now. It recognizes that the proponents of this program call it a "shot-in-the-arm program—a onetime deal." This is reminiscent of the onetime deals of recent history which easily became permanent programs; Hill-Burton hospital construction, Federal aid to impacted areas, and so forth. Nothing

in Government seems more permanent than a onetime deal, a shot-in-the-arm program. Once you get a State, a community, or an individual to the point where the narcotic effect of a shot in the arm seems necessary, you are well on your way to developing another addict. The withdrawal symptoms are terrible indeed to contemplate and the cure is seldom permanent. Just because it is addiction by congressional decree, it does not make the symptoms less lethal:

MOVING IN ON THE SCHOOLS

In both Houses of Congress, committee approval has been given "liberal" bills to solve our educational problems by plunging the deficit-ridden Federal Treasury deeper into this field. The House is expected to pass a bill tomorrow giving scholarships to bright students.

On top of the \$1 billion or so the Government now feeds into public education via various routes, the bills before Congress propose to go directly into the production of scientists, scholars, and teachers.

Over the next several years, these bills propose to dole out up to \$1.5 billion for scholarships, student loans, teacher training, etc.

Up to now, Congress has turned back the energetic effort to get the Government in the school building business. But the scholarship bill is the opening. It heads the same way.

This all is based on the theories that too many gifted youngsters are not going to college simply because they lack the money, and that only the Government can remedy this—generalizations never substantiated.

There literally are thousands of scholarships which go begging every year. And the number of scholarships has been growing fast—the last survey indicated there were nearly 250,000. (The most liberal of the bills before Congress would provide an average of 23,000 a year.)

This is called a "shot-in-the-arm program—a onetime deal" designated merely to stimulate State, local, and private effort for better education. Such programs repress rather than stimulate because they tempt people to depend on others for things they can do better for themselves.

This simply is a part of the irresponsible push toward bigger Federal deficits; more power here in Washington, and less for the States and the people themselves.

Strong and effective endorsement for the Indiana Chamber of Commerce scholarship foundation was quick to come in an outstanding editorial from the Indianapolis Star as well:

INDIANA POINTS THE WAY

Despite the increasingly bad condition of the Federal budget, a renewed effort is being made to push an aid to education measure through the present Congress. A proposal in the House would cost about \$1,070,000,000. The Senate has a bill which would cost about \$1,500,000,000. Both would project the Federal Government into student selection and curricula planning in both public schools and institutions of higher learning.

President Eisenhower's backing of the proposition is tempered by his insistence that Federal scholarships for college students should not be as numerous as these bills provide, and that they should be based on need. Both are good points.

The fact of the matter is that the question of need argues against any action at the present time. If scholarships are to be based on need, Congress has no way to determine how many should be provided nor how much money will be required. It has no figures at all—except pure guesses—on how many able students are prevented by shortage of money

from going to college. Without this information, an intelligent program cannot be set up.

While the new campaign to push this Federal aid bill through was being launched, further action was being carried out in Indiana which shows that the Federal program is not needed here at all. We doubt that it is needed elsewhere. The Indiana State Chamber of Commerce announced the establishment of a foundation to help capable and needy students through college. It is making grants totaling about \$37,000 to 50 graduates of Indiana high schools in this year's class who were identified in the Marion committee survey as promising students who did not have enough resources for their first college year. The committee narrowed the field to 53 who had the ability and needed help, out of a starting group of 2,000 based on the estimates of high-school principles. Some of these already had scholarships, which were not enough to bridge the gap. Three subsequently obtained adequate scholarships. The other 50 will be provided the necessary help by the new foundation.

This is an example of the sensible way to help capable students through college. First find out how many have both the ability and the need, and how much the need is. Then meet the need.

Besides being a badly aimed shot at the target of college financial problems, the Federal proposals include substantial other items of teacher training, equipment and student counseling in the public schools. These are objectionable as Federal intrusions into fields better left to local financing and local control.

Meanwhile, what happened to the highly desirable proposal, advanced in the House by Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, for federal income tax relief for parents or others carrying the load of college expenses. Here is a plan which would provide quick and sure help directly at the point of need, where the bills are being paid. The concern in Congress for helping to get students through college could be excellently expressed by enacting this measure.

I, too would like to ask, "What happened to the highly desirable proposal advanced by our distinguished colleague, dean of the Hoosier delegation, Mr. HALLECK, for Federal income tax relief for parents with children in college?"

Former State Senator Paul W. Kerr of Elkhart, chairman of the State Chamber's Education Committee, reports that a research study just completed by the chamber shows Federal aid advocates "over a period of many years have proclaimed one crisis after another in attempts to justify their programs."

Since 1918, he points out, Federal aid advocates have used arguments based on an "illiteracy crisis," an "Americanization crisis," a "physical and health education crisis," a "teacher crisis," a "school building crisis," a "financial crisis," and a "general school crisis." Despite the fact that bills to provide Federal aid to schools have failed repeatedly since 1918, expenditures on public schools have risen nearly 30 times faster than enrollments.

Mr. Kerr, speaking for the chamber, says:

For the past 10 years especially, the State universities and private colleges have been carrying on an intensive campaign to encourage establishment of scholarships by private sources. In the last few years these efforts have been producing rapidly increasing funds to help qualified students. There is no question in our mind but that

this non-government-controlled scholarship program can and will be expanded and when the possibilities for this type of service to education are explained to more and more individuals, firms, and local civic groups.

He adds this warning:

But one thing appears certain—if the Federal Government moves in with a broad program of scholarship aid from tax funds, the present movement will decline and fail. Meanwhile, there would be further intrusion of centralized government and bureaucracy into matters which can better be handled by the people acting voluntarily.

Indiana's Governor Harold Handley has not hesitated to speak out against the proposed Federal scholarship program. Under date of July 21, 1958, he wrote to me a letter, from which I quote:

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
United States House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHUCK: A hypothesis is only a hypothesis until it is proven or disproven by facts. Following the launching of Sputnik I, we in Indiana began a thorough, factfinding study of our education system, particularly regarding science and mathematics courses, enrollments, and pupil aptitudes. The entire project was conducted by a representative committee of citizens and educators.

Every Indiana ninth-grade student received an identical test, the results being evaluated by a professional laboratory. We also gave an extensive test to high-school seniors to determine exceptional individuals. Then we inquired of these exceptional seniors as to how many wished to enter college, and how many would need financial and scholarship assistance.

The results of these tests and inquiries are detailed in the attached summary. Because there is now before the United States Congress proposed legislation for Federal scholarships, we feel that you might be particularly interested. We are convinced that Indiana does not need such Federal assistance, and that if similar factual inquiry were made in the other States the same conclusions would be tenable regarding them.

Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions, and institutions now independent or State supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually.

Sincerely,

HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
Governor of Indiana.

The issue today is really a simple one. It is not whether you favor Federal scholarships or Federal loans or grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction. It has nothing to do with whether you favor language development or expansion of graduate education or guidance counseling, testing, identification, and encouragement of able students. What we are talking about today does not require you to take a position for or against research and experimentation on more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pic-

tures, and related mediums for educational purposes. We are not debating the desirability of improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

What we are talking about is this: What level of Government is best qualified to initiate, program, and finance the improvements in our educational institutions which have been demanded for nearly 10 years by aroused parents who were disturbed with the lack of opportunity for their student sons and daughters. In other words: "Who does what for who and who provides the money?"

The answer to this question is very simple. The echelon of Government most concerned with these programs and most able to handle and finance them is certainly not the Federal Government. The Federal Government is broke, in debt, and nearly hopelessly entangled in bipartisan self-perpetuating bureaucracy.

The combined debt of our individual States is equivalent to about 12 percent of the national income. The Federal debt is more than 80 percent of the national income. It is folly for Congress to consider adding another tremendous expenditure to the Federal budget for a program not necessary or desirable on the Federal level. After all, Congress is the only body which can authorize spending a cent.

The Education Commission on Intergovernmental Relations said in 1954: "If States cannot find some way to allocate almost \$3 billion in State aid in such a way as to assure adequate educational opportunity, what reason do we have to assume that they could accomplish the objective with the few hundred million dollars in Federal funds?"

The former Commissioner of Education, Dr. John Tigert, says: "My experience in handling Federal subsidies for education under the limited acts which are now in existence has taught me that you must either have Federal control, and interference, or you must have misappropriation of funds and waste. The reason and experience both indicate that Federal money cannot be expended wisely and efficiently except by exercising Federal control and supervision, even though there is considerable waste."

Can we honestly say, as we consider this bill, that there will be no Federal strings attached to the scholarships, no Federal strings on the grants-in-aid to the colleges, no Federal strings to the money spent on our public schools? Our past experience with Federal aid has established that Federal controls invariably follow in its wake * * * controls, waste, higher taxes, and a constantly rising national debt.

Passage of this bill will indicate but one thing to me and to the Hoosiers I represent: That a majority of this Democratic Congress favors Federal controls on almost everything—except Federal spending.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

(Mr. ALGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this aid for education in the grants and loans for scholarships, because it will kill initiative, fail in its objectives, and undermine the entire educational system of our country. First, I want to compliment the authors of the minority report. The good sense and understanding are obvious to me, if not to some of our colleagues. Next, there is the language barrier. Look at the bill from the outset. On page 3 "mental resources" and "emergency" are mentioned. On page 4 "national interest," "defense," "substantial," "various," and "sufficient quality" are other words and terms used. What do these mean in education by use of Federal money? These generalities mean nothing or everything, as you so interpret them. What is the national interest? Is it different from, greater or less, than the interests of States, localities, school boards, and parents. No one is more interested in education of our youth than the parents or the youths themselves. Nor is the Federal Government going to change our educational interests by rerouting the taxpayers' money.

True, as Russia does, we can let the Federal Government take over the education of our youth. It is precisely because parents are more able and interested in education of the young that resulted in the American concept of local control of education.

What is all the fuss over the Soviet system? Theirs is not better than ours. Any faults in our system we can correct our way—not by emulating Russia, not by doing it their way. The greater danger is the abandonment of our form of education, our form of society, our freedom to think, speak, and act, and our form of Government.

Sure, we can turn over the youth of our country to the Federal control but that will defeat, not solve our problems of education. And it will become Federal control even though this bill is a modest beginning. Power ever accompanies money and Federal control follows Federal aid. This bill will be followed by even bigger programs. Let us not sell America short, by fear of Russia. Let us beat them competitively—our way.

The proponents of this bill protest that we want to retain local control. Yet we contradict ourselves by taking Federal money for local education. There can be only one end result—the loss of local control of our educational processes.

We claim that we want our students to be responsible, to feel responsibility—yet we turn around and make them wards of the State and Federal Government. Rest assured that if Uncle Sam hands out the money this way, the philosophy of the soft touch or the goldbrick will replace the waiting on tables and extra work that have made education possible for those lacking funds in the past.

Further, the thousands of presently offered scholarships will dry up—as private enterprise and initiative will be replaced by Federal largess.

It is that simple to me—do we build or do we destroy initiative and freedom?

Not do we get an education or not. The education is available for those seeking it, for those wanting to work for it. And if it is not, we can solve the problem locally and through private enterprise. There are many citizens, organizations, foundations and businesses that will make possible the scholarships and higher education for those seeking them.

In fact, the money comes only from one source—the people, the taxpayers. You can tax and then return the money as Federal aid. Or you can leave the money in the taxpayers' pockets. The road of heavier taxation is to bankruptcy and ruin, not to higher education. Yet that is what we are doing here.

We are in a deficit position \$12 to \$15 billions or more this year. We will meet this deficit by a large tax increase or by inflation with printing press money, cheapening our currency. We have a debt of \$280 billion and contingent liabilities of \$283 billion. By what right do we offer grants and loans under this heavy Federal debt? Is it fair for the heavy laden taxpayer to pay taxes, these to be distributed as scholarships? Maybe the taxpayer prefers shoes for a son or daughter. Maybe he would prefer the student to hustle and earn his way, even as he, the taxpayer, is working to provide the needs for his family. Should he or the Government do the providing? If the taxpayers' money is taken in taxes he will need Federal aid to support and educate his family. So what is the best way to do it—by leaving the fruits of labor, the earnings, in the earners' hands or by Government taking it in taxes to redistribute, to return enough to support him and his family? It is a simple choice—simply explained—with a frighteningly simple conclusion if our choice is wrong. We will all be wards of the Government, not just the students, or those destitute taxpayers who are bankrupted first.

Federal funds in grants and loans for scholarships fails in its objectives, and undermines the entire educational system of our country. I am heartily opposed to this bill and am appalled that such Federal aid should even get the long and serious attention received today on the floor of this House.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, last fall the Russians sent a metal ball whizzing into orbit around the world and promptly set off a psychological panic in this country which was something to behold. Our national pride wounded and our collective ego deflated, we did just what might spontaneously be expected, looked around for somebody or something or some place to lay the blame. Some promptly began to fire shots at the military, then present and past political leaders became targets. And then there were those who sought their solace in criticism of our educational system.

This scholarship legislation by its very quaint title of the National Defense Education Act is the ill-conceived offspring of the waning panic and pressure groups. I submit that this legislation would not be before us today if it had not been for the psychological eruption of these hap-

penings last fall. But the ball was put into motion and gathered enough momentum from certain pressure groups to roll right onto the floor of the House today.

Suspecting that this would be the controversial measure that we find it, I took it upon myself some weeks ago to send out 450 questionnaires at random to colleges and universities across the country. This was a questionnaire which I called a survey of financial aid to college students, and, I might add, it was a reasonably complete and certainly not a loaded questionnaire. It included a request for such information as the number of scholarships available in 1956, 1957, and 1958; total dollar values of such scholarships; number of scholarships granted; and it called for a general explanation as to why various scholarships were not claimed or moneys not used. It further asked whether the particular institution had taken a stand on the proposed Federal scholarship program and, if so, just what that stand was. I stated further in my survey that the sources of my information would be kept confidential, so that there was no need to fear any unfavorable reaction.

Let me assure you that the results were most revealing. I only regret that I have so little time, as I would like to go into these revelations in detail.

Be that as it may, however, I would like to give you some data that I think is most pertinent to this legislation.

Of the 400 of these questionnaires mailed to the college and university presidents, 331 were returned, better than 82 percent. Of the number returned, 215, or about 65 percent, indicated that they preferred to take no position on this legislation. Of the remaining 35 percent, 57 favor this legislation, but 11 of these did so with reservations that would make the bill before us unpalatable. Fifty-nine opposed this legislation without reservation. In other words, of those that did take a position on this bill, 52 percent definitely opposed it.

We must assume that this bill was presented as an answer to a very critical problem. If this were not true, then it should not be before us today. And yet, does it not seem strange that the great educators representing 65 percent of these colleges and universities had not taken a stand on this legislation? I can only submit that there must be rather positive skepticism of it or these people would have rallied to the cause. And does not the fact that the majority of those who took a positive position were opposed to it without reservation offer some significance?

After all, we here are in the business of legislating. The folks I polled in this questionnaire are dedicated 'career' authorities in the field of higher education.

And let me, if I may, just give you excerpts from the remarks which accompanied some of them. From a college president in Ohio, and I quote:

I have grave concern over any gigantic Federal scholarship program. At some point this give-away philosophy will have to stop or it will lead to complete socialism in education.

And from a college president in Michigan, and I quote again:

As a private institution, we covet our independence in this field.

And from still another:

The real crux of this problem is providing jobs for students to enable them to go to school, because tuition represents only a small part of a student's overall expenses.

And from a university in Alaska, and I quote:

For heaven's sake, let's avoid setting up another bureau which will wrap the purse-strings around our necks and demand obedience to every last comma and bureaucratic interpretation.

And from the president of a college in Indiana, and I quote:

We provide in our operating budget a large amount of nonfunded aid beyond endowed scholarships. We prefer even this to seeing the Federal Government embark upon a mass-scale scholarship program."

And from a college in Minnesota the words of the president of the institution, and I quote:

We are opposed to Federal scholarships in any form.

And here is one from a college president in Iowa.

In my personal opinion and in that of most of the members of my staff, we have too many give-away programs now under the guise of scholarship grants.

There is another from one of the eastern universities which said:

We favor a scholarship program only if it is not slanted toward any one field such as, for example, science.

And the next one I shall quote I have intentionally saved for the last because it pretty well sums up my personal philosophy on this legislation. It comes from the president of a college in former President Truman's home State of Missouri and I quote:

This Federal scholarship program reminds me of building an expensive dome or cupola on a very shaky structure.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that once this legislation gets on the books in the comparatively small scale that it is today, that it will mushroom as have other Federal-aid programs that are always placed upon the books as emergency measures. If there is a need in this area of our national life, let us not hastily assume that this type of thing is the answer. Let us not create another Frankenstein that will grow and grow and grow in the years to come with the help of the good Congressman and Senators who will continue to add a thousand and one innovations in the years to come that will make this a political offense education bill instead of a national defense education act.

(Mr. COLLIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this legislation, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity today to congratulate the House Education and Labor Committee on presenting what may be the most significant and important piece of legislation to be considered by Congress this year. The display of scientific know-how and achievement on the part of other peoples of the world challenges America to come forward with a bold and comprehensive program to eliminate the tremendous waste of human resources which occur because of our failure to stimulate a national interest in education and because of the many economic roadblocks which confront the student of today.

In January 1955 and before the sputnik era, I was one of the first Members of Congress to introduce legislation providing for scholarship loans to deserving students seeking higher education. I deemed this legislation highly important to the great number of highly talented young people of my district who failed to commence or complete college education because of the mounting costs involved. In failing to provide these deserving young people with the opportunities for education, we are probably committing our most serious waste of human resources. Education is expensive and in spite of our rising standard of living, it is increasingly difficult for the family of limited means to provide deserving members with a first-rate higher education.

The obvious scientific achievement of the Soviets in the launching of satellites and in development of intercontinental ballistic missiles was a shock to American educational apathy. Drastic steps were in order if America was to continue its leadership in world security and betterment. World War II and the Korean war disclosed educational inadequacy for modern military service, and the national security was threatened by the scientific competition of potential enemies.

If this Congress adopts the measure currently reported by the legislative committees, it will be the most substantial Federal contribution to education since 1862. This legislation is designed to encourage capable young people to continue their educational progress because the Nation cannot afford to waste the abilities of an estimated 200,000 able students who drop out of school each year before college.

This educational program is the soundest legislative approach to our needs in education. While the program may delay for funds until the next Congress, it is an urgent program which merits the support of every American. The educated citizen is better qualified to serve his family, his community, and his Nation. The program is in effect self-liquidating since the more highly trained citizen becomes the better wage-earner and consequently the better taxpayer.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, with interest I have listened to the debate on this bill and I have been moved by the fervor of its proponents and it seemed to me that they were speaking in a spirit of dedication. For the most part, they have been the younger men of the House and I would wish to make the observation that it is most reassuring, this evidence, that in the younger generation of our statesmen remains undiminished the same faith in popular education as that which inspired the fathers of our democracy. Especially do I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. He has rendered to his country a real and a dedicated service in his presentment of the cause of education in the debate in which we are now engaged that has justly won for him the plaudits of his colleagues.

I would be less than frank, however, if I did not state that this, in my opinion, is not a perfect bill. Nothing that comes from human hands and human minds can attain perfection. Whenever man has attained perfection the reasons for his being have ceased to exist. We can give encouragement, aid and incentive to our youth in their quest for knowledge, and that is as it should be, but we have no way of guaranteeing that when they have knowledge they will use that knowledge wisely and that when they become teachers they will be good teachers. That is always the chance we take. That is always the chance we must take if continuous progress is made in the march from the status quo of a today to the broadening promise of a tomorrow.

DEGREES DO NOT A TEACHER MAKE

Higher education itself will not make truly great teachers. We can overdo the placing of the emphasis on a doctorate as the index of teaching superiority. That, I think, has been one of the fallacies of our educational concept. Certainly in mathematics and in science, pretty generally, the postgraduate work that leads to a doctorate is desirable and, in most cases, is probably necessary. Certainly it is something that we should encourage, but there are many areas in which this is not the case, and truly great teachers have been put under a disadvantage and their towering abilities have been subordinated to lesser abilities by the insistence that understanding and knowledge and the knack of conveying understanding and knowledge to others as a teacher is determined solely by the attainment of a degree of master or of doctor. Shakespeare, with a doctor's degree, might never have been Shakespeare.

Mr. Chairman, men and women are what they are and they are to be measured in any field by what they accomplish, what they stand for, and what they are able to impart to others. This is by way of saying that men as well as commercial products are not to be

judged by labels. Title II of this bill, providing for scholarships, is so replete with merit that I cannot see how anyone could quarrel with it.

Title III, providing for loans to students in institutions of higher education, is thoroughly sound, so sound, in fact, that there is little, if any, controversy. It is consistent with our practice of consumer-credit marketing. Homes, automobiles, TV sets, kitchen appliances are made available to our people on time repayments that are secured by expectation of the receipt of wages as yet unearned. Certainly college education increases the earning ability of youth, and loans to make that education possible should be the safest and, from a banking standpoint, the soundest of all loans in the consumer-credit classification.

Title IV, providing grants for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools, most certainly has merit.

TASK IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Title V, concerning foreign-language development, offers a promise that will only be fulfilled if there is wise administration of the program. I am willing to take the chance that after many false starts and readjustments after errors there will be such wise administration. It is not going to be easy by any means, and no one in voting for this bill with its title V program should imagine for 1 minute that he completely has solved the problem of making Americans conversationally at ease with more than one language. Nevertheless, it is a task we must approach, and this at least is a start.

Title VI seeks to advance the expansion of graduate education by providing scholarships and giving monetary assistance to universities in strengthening their graduate programs. The University of Chicago, which is located in the heart of the district I have the honor to represent, long has been rated one of the great graduate schools of the world. I think it is universally acknowledged that the graduate school of the University of Chicago has no graduate school of superior quality in this or any other country. Naturally, any program that aims at expansion of graduate education has my enthusiastic support.

Scholarships for graduate study must recommend themselves to all persons who realize that the Christopher Columboes of today, opening up new worlds of opportunity and enrichment, conquering disease plagues and prolonging the span of human life, are the scientific, engineering, medical, and other scholars who work in graduate schools preparing themselves in the grind of hard work to meet for their country the challenge of a future when we have outleaped old boundaries and have plunged into the space era. This bill is titled "National Defense Education."

The number of scholarships necessary is limited. They must be restricted to those who will make a genuine contribution to scholarship.

COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

Title VII provides for a program of counseling and guidance in secondary

schools. It sounds good and I will support it with the hope that an intelligent administration of the program will get from it the hoped for results. Professional counselors can become like professional mourners. This must be guarded against. Counselors who never think of themselves as professionals, but as human beings just trying to help other human beings, doubtless can do a useful service in furnishing information to those by whom they are consulted and sitting down with them thinking things out together. I hope that all connected with the administration of the program will realize that youth will never accept enforced guidance and that the success of the program in a very large degree depends upon the heart quality and the dedication of the personnel.

TV EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Title VIII provides for studies and surveys to determine the need for new techniques in TV and radio educational programs. I have noticed that whenever there is a legislative headache, and no one has the slightest idea where to hunt for a remedy, the handy solution is a study commission. We have had so many study commissions in recent years that it has seemed to me that we were passing on to future generations not only the payment of our debts but also our headaches.

Yet something can be said for title VIII. Let me illustrate: recently 40 eminent professors at the University of Chicago, including a number whose reputations are international, got up early in the morning for a period of 13 weeks to put on a TV program making the mysteries of science crystal clear to their TV audience. Anyone who turned on his television set at an early hour in the morning stood to learn a good deal about the nature of the world in which he lives.

The public response was terrific. More than 100 primary and secondary schools in Chicago wrote in to station WBKB, and some schools opened their doors an hour earlier that special classes might watch the program on television. This was a worthwhile test that proved something. Unquestionably, it awakened an interest further in studying science. It showed how the most eminent of scientists in the large universities can hold the personal interest of students in the primary and secondary schools and get their message over.

This program was possible only because of the great personal self-sacrifice of 40 eminent professors at the University of Chicago and the contribution in patriotism and public service of the American Broadcasting Co. and Station WBKB.

Mr. Chairman, if 40 professors in Chicago and a radio station, coadventurers in a great experiment, can come up with such results with one program in one city, what may he not expect from the title VIII program, provided of course there is wise administration.

I am giving my full support to this measure, and certainly shall vote against any amendment calculated to reduce it to the stature of a gesture. An amendment we have been told will be offered

with the purpose of removing from the bill most of its substance but leaving just enough to save the faces of those who vote to kill the bill by adopting the amendment, then vote for the emasculated measure to claim credit as a friend of education. It is an old legislative strategy.

NEEDED TAX RELIEF FOR PARENTS

In one regard, I think the bill should be amended by an amendment I have in mind and would offer, were it not subject to a point of order. I would support as an amendment to this bill the subject matter of bills introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], but I realize they are in the classification of tax legislation and under the rules cannot be considered now. Nevertheless, I wish briefly to address myself to a subject in relation to education that is close to my heart.

College education in the United States has been made possible for a majority of our college graduates by the sacrifice of parents, many of whom themselves had enjoyed little if any educational opportunity. The waiter at my hotel who has one son, a doctor, and 2 daughters, both educated at his expense and now teachers in the schools of Washington, is but one of many, many thousands such parents.

Today the financial burden on parents with children in college is heavy. When there are several children of college age the burden in most instances is almost impossible. Yet the parents carry the burden cheerfully and without complaint if by sacrifices and even going into debt, mortgaging their futures, they possibly can make the grade. They want their children to have the same opportunities in life with other children, and they know that the child without college education starts out under a handicap. They want, too, their children to be good and useful citizens, and they know that college education will prepare them for a greater scope of usefulness. That is their stake.

STAKE OF THE STATE IS GREAT

But, Mr. Chairman, the State also has a stake. That we acknowledge when we vote for the bill now before us which provides public funds for scholarships and schools in order that the defense of the Nation will be strengthened by the education of our youth. With every young man and every young woman who comes from college or university, the better prepared for the responsibility of citizenship, our country is the stronger.

Every dollar that a parent pays out for the education of his children, especially in the college period, should be deductible from his income tax accounting. It is a dollar spent in the public interest. It is a dollar spent in making this a better and a stronger nation. Relief along this line is envisioned in the bills introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

In the name of justice, and in the true interest of popular education, they should be enacted. We have plenty of

tax troubles, and always over our heads is the huge public debt with its crushing demand for billions of dollars in interest, but we have no moral right to force money from parents giving college education to their children to make this a stronger nation, forcing them to pay an income tax on money all of which has been legitimately spent on their children's education. I do not wish to be misunderstood. Every dollar spent on tuition and in meeting reasonable expense of college attendance should be subject to tax deduction. This, of course, would not include unusual expenses, certainly not those of a social nature, and to avoid abuse very likely a limitation as to the amount should be written into the law as is done in the case of charitable donations.

TEACHER ON SABBATICAL LEAVE

Mr. Chairman, there is another amendment I would offer were it permissible under the rules. But it, too, is in the field of tax legislation. It would permit a teacher to deduct for income-tax purpose the entire legitimate expense incurred in achieving a higher efficiency in teaching. Let me illustrate: In Chicago the teachers in our public school system are permitted every 7 years to take a sabbatical year of leave, either for travel or study. During the sabbatical year of leave they receive only a portion of their regular salaries. One teacher of whom I know, a language teacher, went to a foreign land to perfect herself in the language of that land which she had been teaching in the schools of Chicago.

She spent the entire year in that land in hard study and in constant association with those of that land that could contribute most to her acquaintance with native expressions and native pronunciations. Her pupils in Chicago were the beneficiaries of her year of language study abroad. The year of hard work meant nothing of personal gain to her in a monetary way since her salary was unaffected by it. The benefit all went to the public interest.

At that time, if I recall correctly, no part of this expense could she deduct for income-tax purposes. Now I think a small part may be included in the exemptions. But, Mr. Chairman, there is no valid reason why every dollar that a teacher spends in such manner, an expenditure that brings no personal monetary advantage but makes a tremendous contribution to the public interest, should be subject to income-tax exemption. There is no reason in the world why a school teacher should not have the same tax exemption right as a businessman who gets credit for the money he spends entertaining prospective customers at night clubs.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill will make a great contribution to the cause of education. Just playing square with the honest-to-goodness teacher, who does a good job, will make another great contribution.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

(Mr. SANTANGELO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANTANGELO. 'Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have this opportunity to support H. R. 13247, the proposed legislation designed mainly to strengthen the national defense by encouraging and assisting in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs. The problem of education is the most vital far-reaching issue facing the American people. America's future success at home and abroad, in peace or war, depends on the education of her citizens. Whatever happens in America's classrooms within the next generation will determine what will happen to America.

The shortcomings that now exist in our public school system are the results of neglect over a long period of time. The responsibility for this rests with all Americans, in one way or another. These shortcomings were there long before the Russian sputnik went into orbit. All of us realize that the passage of this legislation will not provide the immediate, magic formula by which all of the weaknesses of American education can be overcome. It will take another period of time before large scale improvements will be seen in our educational system. However, our best hope is to devote our most diligent efforts to a solution. We cannot begin too soon.

We must enact this proposed legislation with all possible dispatch. The passage of the National Defense Education Act would be a definite beginning toward solving some of the enormous problems that we now face. We are confronted by a most formidable enemy in the race for world supremacy through knowledge. It is time that we stop deploring the present state of American education and begin some constructive action toward improving it.

The recent Rockefeller Bros. Fund Report on Education states that the greatest problem facing American education is, and I quote, "the widely held view that all we require are a few more teachers, a few more buildings, and a little more money." The report goes on to say that "such an approach will be disastrous. We are moving into the most demanding era of our history. We must build for the future in education as daringly and aggressively as we have built other aspects of our national life in the past."

I do not, for a moment, doubt that the American public schools suffer from a lack of adequate teachers and adequate facilities needed to make teaching more effective particularly in science education. This is one of the reasons for my interest in and support of the National Defense Education Act because one of its major provisions is designed especially to strengthen and expand the teaching of mathematics and science in our schools.

I was amazed to learn from Mr. Samuel Schenberg, supervisor of science for the New York City schools, that in the city of New York, the largest city in one of the wealthiest States in our Nation, there is a lamentable shortage in its science teaching staff. These statistics

presented during the Senate hearings on science and education for national defense, at the earlier part of the year, show that of the 632 mathematics teachers in the junior high schools, 310 of them are teaching "out of license" and therefore do not meet the New York City certification requirements for teaching mathematics. The same thing applies to the academic high schools where 25 percent of the mathematics teachers and 10 percent of the science teachers are not certified to teach those subjects. With the vocational high schools in New York City, the statistics are even worse. Between 40 and 50 percent of the science and mathematics teachers are "teaching out of license."

If conditions such as these are present in the school system of such a city as New York, we can well imagine the proportion of the shortage of science teachers throughout the Nation and the urgent need to strengthen and expand facilities for teaching science.

Another area of critical need which this bill seeks to remedy is the loss of talented students between the high school and the college. One is apt to think that in cities, such as New York, great opportunities are available in higher education at modest fees because of the New York City municipal colleges. This for the most part is quite true. Yet, in a study made in 1955 of 340 superior graduates of 3 New York City high schools, it was found that 55 or one-fifth of these superior students failed to enroll in any college. The reason given by the majority of these students for failing to go on to college was the lack of financial help, in spite of the low-cost educational facilities offered by the city.

The provisions contained in H. R. 13247 would make it possible for thousands of our most capable youngsters to get the financial help needed for them to receive the specialized training so vital to our Nation's welfare and defense. Such waste of our human resources has contributed to our present situation, in which, as Dr. Edward Teller, one of our top physicists, declares, our science leadership is "now slipping from our hands and is passing into the hands of the Russians."

I do not believe that the \$17½ million that would be authorized each year for 4 years on scholarships or the amount that would provide for student loans under this legislation would be asking too much, particularly when we consider what we spend on foreign aid.

Can we deny help to educate the children of our taxpayers, when these taxpayers have contributed so greatly to the needs of foreign nations?

Is it asking too much to spend \$60 million a year for 4 years in grants to the States for the acquisition of equipment suitable for teaching science, mathematics, and foreign languages?

Under the National Defense Act of 1958 the States would also be given help to establish guidance programs and personnel in order that we may discover and encourage the gifted boys and girls—those who can make great contributions to our Nation and the world, if but given the chance. It seems to me, Mr. Chair-

man, that \$21 million a year for the next 3 years in order to bolster the intellectual resources of our Nation through an improved guidance and counseling program is not an unreasonable request.

These, and others, are the provisions to be found in H. R. 13247. In my opinion the enactment of these provisions would prove of great value to the American people. It is important that the Government can spend billions of dollars abroad to aid needy nations. We spend that money to buy time to prepare to survive. It is equally important that the Federal Government likewise assist the States in the urgent task of overcoming the serious deficiencies in their school system. If we do not, then the time that we are buying with our generosity will be wasted.

Before closing my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to the speech that the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, made before the National Press Club in Washington on June 13, 1958. The topic of his highly informative talk was entitled "The Russian Race for Knowledge." For those who might still be dubious as to the real intentions of the Soviets in regard to their educational system, I would say that they will find the answer in Dr. Derthick's speech. In this talk he reports on the month-long study made by him and nine other educators in the U. S. S. R. Some of these facts are, to me, most significant, and I should like to emphasize them here. Dr. Derthick states that:

Everywhere in Russia are evidences not only of passionate love of country but of a burning desire to surpass the United States in education, in production, in standard of living, in world trade, and in athletics. The slogan we saw most—in posters, films, and everywhere—was "Reach and Overreach America."

In education the spirit is a race for knowledge, for supremacy in a way of life and in world leadership. * * * They are convinced that time is on their side and they can win world supremacy through education and hard work.

This conviction is basic to all their efforts and all their plans. Education is paramount. It is a kind of grand passion—this conviction that children, schools, and hard work will win them their place in the sun and on the moon.

These facts should serve as much as a warning to us as the launching of the first sputnik. The results that are seen today in the Russian Soviet system have produced through years of rigid planning on the part of that Government. It might very well be said that the Soviet educational system today had its greatest impetus 30 years ago when Joseph Stalin spoke these words to the English All Union Congress of the Young Communist League in 1928. He gave a challenge to the picked youth of the country with these words:

Before us stand the greatest tasks of the reconstruction of our entire public economy. * * * Before us stands a fortress. This fortress is called science with its many branches of knowledge. This fortress we must capture at any cost. This fortress youth must capture, if it wants to be the builder of a new life, if it wants to become the genuine shift of the old guard. * * *

To master science, to forge the new personnel of Bolshevik specialists in all branches of knowledge, to study, to study, to study most stubbornly—such now is our task.

The march of revolutionary youth toward science—this is what we need now, comrades.

These words of Stalin are reflected day in what Dr. Derthick and his colleagues observed in the school system of the Soviet Union.

I do not wish to overburden you with facts of Soviet education. I do wish, however, to point out that in order to bring about the reforms of education in America, in order to strengthen our national defense through education, we shall have to plan systematically. The passage of this legislation would serve as a great stimulant to the American public to overcome the shortcomings that now exist in our educational system. Making it possible for our talented youth to go on to a higher education would provide them with a great incentive to do their best. And the benefits to our Nation of such a program are immeasurable. If we lose the battle of education, we shall not be prepared to adapt ourselves in this changing world in which we live and in the universe where we are planning to travel. This education bill must pass.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I think that the testimony we have heard and the evidence that has been cogently presented by the distinguished members of the Education Subcommittee indicates clearly the need for this national-defense education legislation.

I want to compliment Mr. ELLIOTT for his leadership in this bill. As the distinguished subcommittee chairman has pointed out, some 50 Members of this House have filed bills that would provide for Federal scholarships or Federal loans to needy students attending college. This is not the first year that these bills have been filed. I filed a bill to establish Federal scholarship loans in the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses, and my predecessor from the Second Massachusetts District, Foster Furculo, now the Governor of Massachusetts, filed the bill in the 82d Congress. But this is the first year that a bill has been reported to the floor after 12 months of intensive study and hearings, conducted both in Washington and around the country.

Mr. Chairman, the issue here is simple. Are we going to let a vast reservoir of youthful American brainpower be drained away into uselessness and thus make no contribution to the greatness and strength of America because high-school graduates of ability cannot afford to go to college? We have heard it stated that one-half of the bright high-school students in the United States are not entering college because of lack of financial assistance. This is not so in the Soviet Union. For several years the Soviets have been producing twice as many scientists as the United States.

Scientific witnesses in this country tell us that Soviet Russia is 2 years ahead of the United States in the field of space exploration and missiles development. We have got to close this gap by channeling more high-school graduates into the scientific and engineering fields.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that neither the President nor Members of this House supporting this legislation mean to imply that privately endowed scholarship funds have not been meeting this challenge. They have assisted thousands of able students through college, and should be encouraged. But this bill is intended to augment the financial resources of these privately endowed funds so that many more bright young students can go on to college with scholarship and loan assistance.

Students who will take advantage of these Federal scholarships and loans will not be limited to pursuing courses in science and engineering. The development of their latent abilities is encouraged in the arts and other fields. For instance, the bill would give financial assistance to educational institutions to establish modern foreign-language institutes and centers and assist students studying foreign languages. There is a great need for more of these language institutes and for people in Government and industry who can speak Russian, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Hindi, and other languages. There are only a few foreign-language institutes in this country, one of them the great Georgetown University Institute of Languages and Linguistics here in Washington, D. C. This institute has made an inestimable contribution in the language field since it was founded. The need for more language-training facilities is brought out clearly in the committee report, which states:

As a nation we are not prepared linguistically to exercise the full force of our leadership in the building of a peaceful world. Some 3 million Americans, including members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, are reported to be living, traveling, and working overseas each year. Few Americans available for overseas assignments have had any foreign language training. Most Americans who do study foreign languages start too late and stop too soon to become proficient in the use of the language.

As one of the sponsors of legislation to establish a Federal scholarship-loan program for students of ability needing financial assistance to obtain a higher education, I urge my colleagues to support the national defense education bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, there are several misapprehensions about this bill. All the discussion this morning has been about scholarships. This has been mislabeled a scholarship bill. With the amendments which will be offered, the amount of money authorized annually for scholarships will be \$7,500,000. The amount of money under the title to which I will address most of my remarks

to the \$60 million a year—matching program with the States—for laboratory equipment and modern teaching devices for our schools.

This is not a broad Federal-aid program. We have pending before this House for action now a program designed to aid areas where there is economic distress. This legislation essentially is a bill designed to aid neglected areas in the field of education.

We have had a great deal of talk about the national defense aspects of the legislation. Sputniks were mentioned a moment ago. I would say to the Members of the House that for my own part I was not overly disturbed by the sputniks, because I knew that any great nation which dedicates all its efforts and economic wealth toward the achievement of a single national project can achieve it. But I was disturbed far more by the reports by those who have studied the Russian educational system recently that the best paid people in Russia today are the ablest scholars and educators. There is something, I think, that should give us pause. This fight in the field of education is not something that concerns us tomorrow, nor need we expect results from this legislation next year or the year following that. Dr. Wernher von Braun told our committee that we could do nothing to aid him and his missile experts next year or the year after that. He stated that his specialists graduated from our universities 5, 10, 15, and more years ago.

This is a long-haul program, and it is not designed to produce spectacular immediate results.

Our hearings disclosed several educational areas of neglect. For example, our country has about 27,000 high schools. Yet only 60 of these have the modern electronic equipment for the teaching of foreign languages. And again, it is a fact that the Armed Forces spend more money for film for educational purposes each year than all the schools in the United States combined. And it is estimated that less than 10 percent of the students today have adequate access to educational film available for use by public schools.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is designed to make a start toward correcting this situation. It is not going to be done at one fell swoop, but it must be done step by step. We are here making a first step in the field of the sciences, languages, and mathematics—areas in our educational system where there has been sore neglect in recent years.

Title 4 of this bill provides \$60 million under a matching program with the States for modern laboratory and visual-aid equipment for public elementary and high schools. The sad truth is that a large majority of our schools do not have modern equipment and teaching devices. Such facilities have been considered luxuries by most schools. This legislation will take a long stride toward remedying this serious and hampering shortage.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I am really sorry that we are trying to solve this tremendously important question here today in a few hours. As important as education is in our system and way of life, it certainly deserves more attention than that. Because of this time limit, I will be forced to confine my remarks to a very brief statement, and that will not be adequate to deal with this very important subject.

I want to point out, first, that I have been interested in education for a long time. I am a former teacher. I was chairman and the ranking member of education committee of the Iowa Legislature for 10 years, and most people in Iowa recognize that we made at least some progress in that time. So, I have had a lot of interest in education since I have been in Congress, and I have been following closely the debate on this question. I have read almost in detail the testimony before your committee, and I want to say to you, first of all, that in my opinion, you have not given proper and complete attention yet to the total problem in the field of higher education. You have come up with some answers that are only part answers and unfair answers, and specifically I am talking about the scholarship section, which, in my opinion, promotes and encourages inequality in education and not equality. And, most of all, it deals with something that is of less importance. The most important phase of education, in my opinion, is the humanities, and the great leaders in education in America will tell you that.

Mr. Chairman, I have a report here of the recent meeting, and I assure the Members that the committee is aware of that report. And, I want to say to you in this connection there is not an educational leader or head of an educational institution in the State of Iowa that backs this section of the bill with any enthusiasm; in fact, in my district most of them are opposed to it.

Now, I have telegrams here from presidents of these institutions, and I would like to put them in the RECORD.

LITTLE FALLS, MINN., August 8, 1958.
Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Highly recommended passage housing loan bill with aid for classroom buildings. Scholarship program will not help much, as we have nearly all able students who wish to go to college already. Don't forget equal stress on humanities in any program. We need science buildings and equipment most of all.

DR. MILLARD G. ROBERTS,
President, Parsons College.

MT. PLEASANT, IOWA, August 8, 1958.
Representative FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I feel current bill in favor of scholarships for science, math and foreign language students is unfair to the total educational program. It should also include humanities and social science students. Science is important but should not be promoted at expense of the humanities. I do favor your

bill allowing tax deductions for tuition and other college expenses.

J. RAYMOND CHADWICK,
President, Iowa Wesleyan College.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Utah referred to a research study.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Because I have had a great interest in this study and because I have had a research team of college students studying this question, dating back as much as 3 years, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes so that I can get their findings into the RECORD and let the membership hear the statement of the college students, who are graduate students, on this subject and who have spent a lot of time doing research in this area.

While recognizing the need for some kind of Federal assistance or policy of the Government that will be advantageous and encouraging to the expanded needs for more effective education in the field of higher education, which the sponsors of this legislation sincerely seek to provide, I must say that I am not particularly enthusiastic about this bill.

I am convinced that there are features in this bill with which many of the best educators in America would disagree. In my opinion, they include—

The inflexibility in the amounts of the scholarships provided;

The requirement that the institutions provide 25 percent of the loan fund;

The subsidization of special fields such as science, mathematics and foreign language, without recognizing the total need;

The provisions which appear to encourage the establishment of new or expanded graduate schools rather than to aid the existing graduate schools; and

The emphasis upon guidance and counseling, fields in which most educators agree that very effective work is already being done.

If Congress wishes to do something for higher education, and I think they should, then let us consider a number of propositions that have been before Congress that seek to help every boy and girl who can qualify and wants to take advantage of the opportunities offered in the institutions of higher learning of their choice. Having had great interest in this field for many years, I directed my research staff at the University of Iowa, composed of senior and graduate students working under the direction of competent instructors in the school, to explore this field over 2 years ago to determine first the need and second the best way, if there was a need, to solve the problem. After a thorough and exhaustive study, my staff found that there was a need to improve the opportunities for education for everyone who has a desire to go to college. This study is reflected in H. R. 9414 which I respectfully call to the attention of the Members.

A study of the feelings and needs of at least one of the State institutions in the State of Iowa on the so-called defense scholarships, they indicate—

First. Because tuition fees generally do not cover the total cost of education, each college or university should receive some pay for every United States scholar enrolled under this section in case this bill becomes law. The prescribed administrative procedures seem complicated and will require large sums of money for administration. The privilege of free choice of college or university, although quite understandable in Federal legislation, will create complications particularly in reference to distribution of enrollments.

If awards are determined by examination, probably all students should be awarded scholarships on the basis of examinations passed, but the amounts can still be scaled to individual needs.

Second. Student loans: The provision for student loans on the basis of need with the privilege of beginning repayment after graduation at low rates of interest could be beneficial, involve relatively few financial hazards and be operable on a relatively low cost for administration. In terms of usefulness, I would place loans ahead of scholarships.

Third. Equipment: This feature of the bill providing for equipment to be used in teaching on a 50-50 matching basis for elementary and high schools should materially improve the quality of instruction. It deserves high priority.

Fourth. Language and area training: The overall effect of this language training program would be very important and probably amply justify the contemplated investment. I am puzzled, however, as to the procedures to be used to administer the stipulation that trainees agree to stay in and/or enter foreign language teaching. It needs clarification.

Fifth. Graduate education: In reference to graduate fellowships, the same remarks apply as have been made above for defense scholarships.

The graduate education section of this bill obviously contemplates expansion of graduate instruction not only in institutions now offering it on a large scale, but by encouraging other institutions to introduce training at the graduate level. In view of the total sum contemplated for graduate education in the bill, I believe the major effects of this section if passed as now written would be to expand and strengthen graduate education in institutions now offering it. Direct subsidy to a graduate student is only part of an institution's problem in providing graduate instruction; a prime necessity becomes the need for capital facilities both for instruction and housing with increasing emphasis on the latter for married students. Specialized teaching facilities such as laboratory and library are essential and particularly costly at the graduate level if operated on the quality level which good graduate education would require.

In my opinion, we should not unduly encourage establishment of new graduate schools until our present ones are strong and until it is evident that the

present schools are not and cannot fill the need.

The provision to make contributions to institutions for expansion of graduate facilities on a 50-50 matching basis will necessitate very careful study by tax-supported institutions and necessitate well-coordinated State and Federal programs in handling of funds made available by legislatures.

Sixth. Guidance and secondary schools: Passage of this provision would throw an immediate load on universities to provide training programs for aptitude testing and guidance.

Seventh. Research in TV, radio, and films: This provision would accelerate attainment of objective data based upon experiments and consequently permit earlier and more reliable application of these communications media to all types of instruction. Use of these media would "stretch" the current supply of teachers and permit fuller utilization of particularly gifted classroom teachers. This however I believe would merit much more study before we launch out in this area.

In addition to the above, I should like to offer the following queries or comments:

Section 206 (a): Who designates an agency if there is no State commission on scholarships? Should the bill not permit the Governor to do so?

Section 206 (a) (3) (i): "Such need to be determined without regard to tuition, fees, and other expenses of attendance at the institution of higher education chosen by the individual." Does this give public institutions the advantage? Is that the meaning and intent?

Section 303 (a), 11.18 to 11.22: Suppose the amount requested by an institution is excessive? Should not proportionate allotments bear some relation to enrollment?

Section 303 (b): Does the State University of Iowa, for example, apply for \$250,000 or for enough money to insure that its prorated sum will be \$250,000? Might one small college apply for \$1 million (or \$250,000) and another (a more honest one) for \$100,000? The needs might be the same, but the allotment vastly different.

Section 304 (2): "Provide for deposit in such fund of (b) an amount, not less than 25 percent thereof, contributed by such institution." I doubt that funds administered by the Board of Regents and this institution for loans can lawfully be pooled in this fashion.

Section 305 (b) (3): The State University of Iowa, and probably others, has loan funds which could not be changed to meet the 2 percent and 4 percent provision.

Section 305 (b) (5): The above comment also applies to this provision.

Section 305 (b) (7): Upon transfer or assignment does the new institution—out of its loan fund—pay the transferring or assigning institution the sum lent by it up to that time?

Section 306: Does the loan fund terminate at July 1, 1966? And thereafter is it liquidated as rapidly as principal and interest come in?

Section 307 (a), 11.18 to 11.22: It is not certain that the board of regents of this institution has the authority to borrow for this purpose in the absence of a statutory enactment.

Title IV, grants for science, and so forth, page 30: Is the laboratory school of a university eligible? Is it a "public" school within the meaning of section 103 (i), (j), and (m)?

Title V, language development, section 501 (a): "Short-term regular session institutes for advanced training." Does this include teaching or supervising or training teachers of any modern foreign language at elementary, secondary or higher education levels?

Section 501 (b): Does this mean "all" or "any part of" the cost?

[Mr. DONOHUE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say first, in at least partial answer to what the gentleman has said, that we gave the matter that he is talking about great consideration, and the fact that the scholarships themselves were not nailed down with too strong a spike indicates that we gave considerable consideration to the point that he makes.

The second point I want to call attention to, Mr. Chairman, is this, and it comes from the report of the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School:

A recent survey covering 147 representative public and private colleges and universities during the period 1950-54, showed that nearly two-thirds of all scholarships paid less than 20 percent of the total college expenses of the holders. Graduates reported a median total 4-year expenditure of \$5,020, of which only 6.4 percent, or \$320, came from scholarship funds.

We tried to fashion this bill in such a way as to give encouragement; not to do the whole job but to give encouragement. If you were needy and were able to get the \$1,000, nobody thinks that that is anything like sufficient to send the holder of that scholarship through college.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the "National Defense Education Act of 1958."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title I—General Provisions

- Sec. 101. Findings and declaration of policy.
- Sec. 102. Federal control of education prohibited.
- Sec. 103. Definitions.

Title II—National Defense Scholarships

- Sec. 201. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 202. Amount of scholarships.
- Sec. 203. Duration of scholarships.
- Sec. 204. Selection of recipients of scholarships.
- Sec. 205. Allotment of appropriations for scholarships.
- Sec. 206. State scholarship commissions; State plans.
- Sec. 207. Administrative expenses of State commissions.

Title III—Loans to Students in Institutions of Higher Education

- Sec. 301. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 302. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 303. Payment of Federal capital contributions.
- Sec. 304. Conditions of agreements.
- Sec. 305. Terms of loans.
- Sec. 306. Distributions of assets from student loan funds.
- Sec. 307. Loans to institutions.
- Sec. 308. Administrative provisions.

Title IV—Grants to States for Strengthening Science, Mathematics, and Modern Foreign Language Instruction in Public Schools

- Sec. 401. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 402. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 403. State plans.
- Sec. 404. Payments to States.

Title V—Language Development

- Sec. 501. Language institutes.
- Sec. 502. Language and area centers.
- Sec. 503. Research and studies.
- Sec. 504. Appropriations authorized.

Title VI—Expansion of Graduate Education

- Sec. 601. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 602. Number of fellowships.
- Sec. 603. Award of fellowships and approval of institutions.
- Sec. 604. Fellowship stipends.
- Sec. 605. Fellowship conditions.

Title VII—Guidance, Counseling, Testing; Identification and Encouragement of Able Students

Part A—State Programs

- Sec. 701. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 702. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 703. State plans.
- Sec. 704. Payments to States.

Part B—Institutes in Guidance and Counseling

- Sec. 721. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 722. Purpose.
- Sec. 723. Contract authority.
- Sec. 724. Stipends.

Title VIII—Research and Experimentation in More Effective Utilization of Television, Radio, Motion Pictures, and Related Media for Educational Purposes

- Sec. 801. Appropriations authorized; functions of Commissioner.

Title IX—Miscellaneous Provisions

- Sec. 901. Administration.
- Sec. 902. Improvement of statistical services of State Educational agencies.
- Sec. 903. Disapproval of, and failure to comply with, State plans.
- Sec. 904. Judicial review.
- Sec. 905. Method of payment.
- Sec. 906. Administrative appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 907. Acceptance of gifts and bequests.
- Sec. 908. Allotments to Territories and possessions.
- Sec. 909. Advisory committees.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Findings and declaration of policy

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. This requires programs that will demonstrate our country's recognition of and esteem for those of our students who have striven to develop their intellectual abilities to the fullest extent, and will make available greater intellectual opportunities that are challenging to our youth.

The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education.

The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense.

To meet the present educational emergency requires additional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore the purpose of this act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals for study at institutions of higher education, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 102. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Definitions

SEC. 103. As used in this act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, except that as used in section 205 (a), 402, or 702, such term does not include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a 2-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II, such term includes an institution, not located in any State, which the Commissioner determines to be substantially comparable to an institution which comes within the preceding provisions of this subsection. For purposes of titles II and III, such term includes any private business school or technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(c) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(e) The term "State Commission" means a State Commission on Scholarships established or designated in any State to participate in a program under title II.

(f) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the governor or by State law.

(g) The term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive, and such school-age population for the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the population between such ages for the most recent year

for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

(h) The term "resident" when used with respect to any State shall have the meaning established by regulations of the Commissioner and shall include a citizen of the United States who is domiciled in such State but is living outside of any State.

(i) The term "elementary school" means a public school which provides elementary education as determined under State law.

(j) The term "secondary school" means a public school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(k) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of elementary schools or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

(l) The term "nonprofit," as applied to a school or institution, means a school or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(m) The term "public" as applied to any school or institution does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 201. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years the sum of \$17,500,000 for scholarships to persons who have not previously been awarded scholarships under this title and who are selected for award of such scholarships by the State commissions. In addition there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years such sums as are estimated to be necessary for making payments to individuals who have previously been awarded scholarships under this title. Scholarships awarded under this title shall be known as "National Defense Scholarships."

Amount of scholarships

SEC. 202. Persons awarded scholarships under this title shall be paid \$500 during each academic year of the scholarships' duration as provided in section 203. Any such person who is determined by the State commission, in accordance with the provisions of the State plan referred to in section 206 (a) (3), to need additional financial assistance to continue his education at an institution of higher education, shall be paid an additional amount, not to exceed \$500, during each such year based on his financial need, such amount to be determined in accordance with such provisions.

Duration of scholarships

SEC. 203. The duration of a national defense scholarship awarded under this title shall be a period of time not in excess of 4 academic years, as defined in regulations of the Commissioner, or, subject to regulations of the Commissioner, such longer period as is normally required to complete the undergraduate curriculum which the recipient is pursuing; but in no event shall the duration extend beyond the completion by the recipient of the work for his first bachelor's degree. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, a scholarship awarded under this title shall entitle the recipient to payments for such period only if the Commissioner finds that he (1) devotes essentially full time to educational work leading to a bachelor's degree, during the academic year, in attendance at an institution of higher education, (2) is main-

taining satisfactory proficiency in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution which he is attending, and (3) is not receiving expenses of tuition or other scholarship or fellowship aid or educational assistance from other Federal sources (other than a monetary allowance under a Reserve officers' training program or money paid under other provisions of this act).

Selection of recipients of scholarships

SEC. 204. (a) An individual shall be eligible to compete in any State for a national defense scholarship if he (1) is a resident of the State; (2) makes application in accordance with such rules as the State Commission for such State may establish; and (3) is not, or has not been, enrolled in any course of study beyond the secondary school level.

(b) From among those competing for national defense scholarships for each fiscal year, each State commission, within the amount allotted to it for scholarships under section 205 (a), shall select persons who are to be awarded such scholarships during such year. Each State commission shall select persons to be awarded such scholarships in accordance with objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability to pursue successfully at an institution of higher education a course of study leading to a bachelor's degree, giving special consideration to those with superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern foreign language.

(c) The Commissioner shall award a National Defense Scholarship to each person with respect to whom he receives a certification from a State Commission that such person—

(1) has been selected for a National Defense Scholarship under the provisions of this section,

(2) has been accepted for enrollment by an institution of higher education, and

(3) (A) holds a certificate of graduation, based on completion of the 12th grade, from any high school whose graduates meet the requirements established by the State in which such school is located for graduation from high schools accredited by such State, or (B) in the case of an individual who does not hold such a certificate, is determined by such State Commission to have attained a level of advancement generally accepted as constituting the equivalent of that required for graduation from such a high school.

Allotment of appropriations for scholarships

SEC. 205. (a) From the sum appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to the first sentence of section 201 the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 percent of such sum, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 908. The remainder of such sum shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States as follows: Each State shall be allotted an amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate sum being allotted as its population between ages of 18 and 21, both inclusive, bears to the total population of all the States between such ages. For the purposes of this section, populations between such ages shall be determined on the basis of the populations between such ages for the most recent year, after 1955, for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

(b) Sums appropriated under the second sentence of section 201 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1959, shall be allotted by the Commissioners among the States on the basis of the relative amounts estimated to be needed to make continuing payments for each such year to persons selected by the State Commissions to be awarded Na-

tional Defense Scholarships in previous years.

State scholarship commissions; State plans

SEC. 206. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the scholarship program under this title may do so by establishing a State Commission on Scholarships, or by designating an existing agency of the State to serve as State Commission on Scholarships, and by submitting to the Commissioner, through such commission a State plan which—

(1) provides for the determination of the institutions in the State which are institutions of higher education as defined in section 103 (b);

(2) provides for the determination, in accordance with the provisions of section 204, of eligibility to compete for National Defense Scholarships, for the selection, in accordance with such provisions, of persons to be awarded such scholarships out of the State's allotment, and for certification of such persons to the Commissioner;

(3) provides (A) for the annual determination of the additional amounts to be awarded persons in need thereof under section 202 in accordance with standards, procedures, and criteria established by the State Commission, which the Commissioner finds provide reasonable assurance (i) that the additional amount will be based on the individual's need for financial assistance to continue his education at an institution of higher education, such need to be determined without regard to tuition, fees, and other expenses of attendance at the institution of higher education chosen by the individual, and (ii) that the maximum additional amount allowable under the plan shall be \$500, and (B) for the annual certification, of each such additional amount and the person to whom it is to be paid, to the Commissioner;

(4) provides that the State Commission will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(5) provides that the State commission will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title; and

(6) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this title.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which complies with the conditions specified in subsection (a).

Administrative expenses of State commissions

SEC. 207. The Commissioner shall pay to each State such amounts as the Commissioner determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan (including reimbursement to the State for expenses which the Commissioner determines were necessary for the preparation of the State plan approved under this title).

TITLE III—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in such institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$40 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, \$60 million for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or com-

plete their education. Sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agreements between the Commissioner and institutions of higher education, for payment of Federal capital contributions which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan funds.

Allotments to States

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1962, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all of the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year ending after June 30, 1962, shall be allotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purpose for which such amounts are appropriated.

Payment of Federal capital contributions

SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which institutions of higher education in a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions from the allotment of such State. In the event the total requested in such applications, which are made by institutions with which he has agreements under this title and which meet the requirements established in regulations of the Commissioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to the total requested in all such applications. In the event the total requested in such applications which are made by institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Commissioner may reallocate the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under section 302 for such year. The Federal capital contribution to an institution shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan fund.

(b) In no case may the total of such Federal capital contributions to any institution of higher education for any fiscal year exceed \$250,000.

Conditions of agreements

SEC. 304. An agreement with any institution of higher education for Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner under this title shall—

(1) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by such institution;

(2) provide for deposit in such fund of (A) the Federal capital contributions, (B) an amount, not less than 25 percent thereof, contributed by such institution, (C) collections of principal and interest on student loans made from such fund, and (D) any other earnings of the fund;

(3) provide that such student loan fund shall be used only for loans to students in accordance with such agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this title, and for costs of litigation arising in connection

with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest on such loan; and

(4) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this title and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the institution.

Terms of loans

SEC. 305. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year to any student made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed \$1,000, and the total for all years to any student from such funds may not exceed \$5,000.

(b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by any institution of higher education shall be made on such terms and conditions as the institution may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the institution) with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of study; and except that—

(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study and has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate or graduate student;

(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount in equal annual installments over a 10-year period which begins 1 year after the borrower ceases to be a full-time student at the institution of higher education which made the loan or at any other institution which is participating in the program established under this title (or, if not participating, has been approved by the Commissioner for the purpose of this paragraph): *Provided*, That such 10-year period may be extended for good cause determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

(3) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, at the rate of 2 percent per annum during the period prior to the first year for which repayment of an installment on the principal is due (such interest to be paid annually during such period) and at the rate of 4 percent per annum after such period: *Provided*, That the borrower may at his option repay all or any part of the loan in advance of the time or times when due, and such repayment shall be made without penalty and without advancing the first year for which interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum, in lieu of 2 percent per annum, would otherwise be payable under this title;

(4) no security or endorsement may be required for any such loan unless the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation;

(5) the liability to repay any such loan shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

(6) such a loan by an institution for any year shall be made in such installments as may be provided in regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with the institution under this title and, upon notice to the Commissioner by the institution that any recipient of a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any or all further

installments of his loan shall be withheld, as may be appropriate; and

(7) no note or other evidence of such a loan may be transferred or assigned by the institution of higher education making the loan except, upon the transfer of the borrower to another institution of higher education participating in the program under this title (or, if not participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by the Commissioner for such purpose), to such institution.

(c) An agreement under this title for payment of Federal capital contributions to any institution of higher education shall include provisions designed to make loans from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement reasonably available (to the extent of the available funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such institution in need thereof.

Distribution of assets from student loan funds

SEC. 306. (a) After June 30, 1966, and not later than September 30, 1966, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the student loan fund established under this title by each institution of higher education as follows:

(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1966, as the total amount of the Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Commissioner under this title bears to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the institution's capital contributions to such fund.

(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the institution.

(b) After September 30, 1966, each institution with which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this title shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the institution after June 30, 1966, in payment of principal or interest on student loans made from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of litigation incurred in collection thereof and not already reimbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of principal or interest) as was paid to the Commissioner under subsection (a).

(c) Upon a finding by the institution or the Commissioner prior to July 1, 1966, that the liquid assets of a student loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this title exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the foreseeable future, and upon notice to such institution and to the Commissioner, there shall be, subject to such limitations as may be included in regulations of the Commissioner or in such agreement, a capital distribution from such fund. Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed as the Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner to the student loan fund prior to such distribution bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the capital contributions to the fund made by the institution.

(2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall be paid to the institution.

Loans to institutions

SEC. 307. (a) Upon application by any institution of higher education with which he has made an agreement under this title, the Commissioner may make a loan to such institution for the purpose of helping to finance the institution's capital contributions to a student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Any such loan may be made only if such institution shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-

Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this title. Loans made to institutions under this section shall bear interest at a rate equal to one-fourth of 1 percent above the rate payable by the Commissioner to the Treasury for funds borrowed to finance such loans.

(b) (1) For the purpose of financing loans to institutions under this section, the Commissioner shall issue notes, debentures, or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury. Obligations issued by the Commissioner under this subsection shall be in such form and denominations, and be subject to such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such obligations shall bear interest at a rate sufficient to cover the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this section.

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations of the Commissioner issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Commissioner's obligations hereunder. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, together with repayments made by institutions hereunder, for payments on obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section. Any such repayments not required for such purpose shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) Loans made by the Commissioner under this section shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Commissioner to be appropriate in each case, but not exceeding 15 years.

Administrative provisions

SEC. 308. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the other powers conferred upon him by this title, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this title and to compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title, except that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the power of the Attorney General in the conduct of litigation arising under this act.

(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

TITLE IV—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$60 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agencies under this title for the acquisition of equipment (suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language) and for minor remodeling which are referred to in paragraph (1) of section 403 (a). There are hereby author-

ized to be appropriated \$5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agencies under this title to carry out the programs referred to in paragraph (5) of section 403 (a).

Allotments to States

SEC. 402. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 401 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 percent thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 908. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

(A) the school-age population of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)),

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(2) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 100 percent less the product of (A) 50 percent and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the continental United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 33⅓ percent or more than 66⅔ percent. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1959, on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for the continental United States for the 3 most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1960, and the second shall be conclusive for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1962.

(3) For the purposes of this title—

(A) The term "child of school age" means a member of the population between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive.

(B) The term "continental United States" does not include Alaska.

(C) The term "income per child of school age" for any State or for the continental United States means the total personal income for the State and the continental United States, respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in such State and in the continental United States, respectively.

(4) A State's allotment under this subsection shall remain available for payment pursuant to section 404 (a) for projects in such State until the end of the fiscal year following the year for which the allotment is made.

(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the second sentence of section 401 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 percent thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 908. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be neces-

sary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

State plans

SEC. 403. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

(1) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 402 (a) will be expended solely for projects approved by the State educational agency for (A) acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audio-visual materials and equipment and printed materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language, for use in elementary or secondary schools, or both, and (B) minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such materials or equipment;

(2) sets forth principles for determining the priority of such projects in the State for assistance under this title and provides for undertaking such projects, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

(3) provides an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency to interested persons with respect to each application for the approval of such a project under this title;

(4) provides for the establishment of standards on a State level for laboratory and other special equipment acquired with assistance furnished under this title;

(5) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 402 (b) will be expended solely for (A) expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and (B) administration of the State plan;

(6) provides that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(7) provides that the State educational agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title; and

(8) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this title.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

Payments to States

SEC. 404. (a) From a State's allotment for a fiscal year under section 402 (a), the Commissioner shall, from time to time during the period such allotment is available for payment as provided in paragraph (4) of section 402 (a), pay to such State an amount equal to one-half of the expenditures for projects for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling referred to in paragraph (1) of section 403 (a) which are carried out under its State plan approved under section 403 (b); except that no State shall receive payments under this subsection for any period in excess of its allotments for such period under section 402 (a).

(b) From a State's allotment under section 402 (b) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner shall from time to time pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended by such State for such year to carry out the program referred to in paragraph (5) of section 403 (a) under its State plan approved under section 403 (b). From a State's allotment under section 402 (b) for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1960, and for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years, such payment shall equal 50 percent of the amount so expended under its State plan approved under section 403 (b); except that no State shall receive payments under this subsection for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under section 402 (b) for that fiscal year.

TITLE V—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Language institutes

SEC. 501. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, of short-term regular-session institutes for advanced training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers of any modern foreign language in schools at the elementary or secondary level or in institutions of higher education.

(b) A contract pursuant to this section may cover all or any part of the cost of the institute with respect to which it is made, and may be made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(c) The Commissioner is also authorized during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals attending any institute established under this section, including allowances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of residence.

Language and area centers

SEC. 502. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, of centers for the teaching of any modern foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner determines (1) that individuals trained in such language are needed by the Federal Government or by business, industry, or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States. Any such contract may provide for instruction not only in such modern foreign language but also in other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used, to the extent adequate instruction in such fields is not readily available, including fields such as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology. Any such contract may cover not more than 50 percent of the cost of the establishment and operation of the center with respect to which it is made, including the cost of grants to the staff for travel in the foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject matter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working is concerned and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to such centers to teach or assist in teaching therein and the cost of their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(b) The Commissioner is also authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals undergoing advanced training in any modern foreign language (with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a)), and other fields needed for a full understanding of the area, region, or country in which such language is commonly used, at short-term or regular session of any institution of higher education, including allowances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of resi-

dence, but only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients of such stipends will, on completion of their training, be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an institution of higher education or for such other service of a public nature as may be permitted in regulations of the Commissioner.

Research and studies

SEC. 503. The Commissioner is authorized, directly or by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages and other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the area, regions, or countries in which such languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in such training teachers of such languages or in such fields.

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 504. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, not to exceed \$4,500,000 in any one fiscal year.

TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

SEC. 601. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Number of fellowships

SEC. 602. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, the Commissioner is authorized to award one thousand fellowships under the provisions of this title, and during each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award 1,500 such fellowships. Such fellowships shall be for periods of study not in excess of 3 academic years.

Award of fellowships and approval of institutions

SEC. 603. (a) The Commissioner shall award fellowships under this title to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by him under this section. The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding that:

(1) such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded.
(2) such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation, and

(3) in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs preference will be given to persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education.

(b) The total of the fellowships awarded under this title for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program at any institution of higher education may not exceed a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the objective referred to in subsection (a) (2).

Fellowship stipends

SEC. 604. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of \$2,000 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate degree, \$2,200 for the second such year, and \$2,400 for the third such year, plus an additional amount of \$400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study such amount, not less than \$500 or more than \$2,500 per academic year, as is determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the

new graduate program or of the expansion in an existing graduate program which he is pursuing, which is reasonably attributable to such person.

Fellowship conditions

SEC. 605. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 604 (a) only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities approved by the Commissioner.

TITLE VII—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

Part A—State programs

Appropriations Authorized

SEC. 701. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, for making grants to State educational agencies under this part to assist them to establish and maintain programs of testing and guidance and counseling.

Allotments to States

SEC. 702. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 701 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 percent thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 908. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of school-age populations of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total of increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

State Plans

SEC. 703. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

(1) sets forth (A) a program under which funds paid to the State under this part will be expended by the State educational agency, or granted by it to local educational agencies in the State for expenditure, to establish or maintain programs of testing and guidance and counseling which will operate in the secondary schools of such State and be directed at (i) identifying students with outstanding aptitude and ability in such schools, (ii) advising students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (iii) encouraging students with outstanding aptitude and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions after completion of their secondary school education; and (B) the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such programs;

(2) sets forth the purposes for, and the conditions under which funds paid to a State under this part will be granted to local educational agencies in such State;

(3) provides that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(4) provides that the State educational agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this part; and

(5) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this part.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

Payments to States

SEC. 704. Payment under this part shall be made to those State educational agencies which administer plans approved under section 703. For the fiscal year ending therefor to the Commissioner. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, such payments shall equal the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal 50 percent of the amount so expended; except that no State educational agency shall receive payment under this part for any fiscal year in excess of that State's allotment for that fiscal year as determined under section 702.

Part B—Institutes in guidance and counseling

Appropriations Authorized

SEC. 721. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$6 million, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the 8 succeeding fiscal years, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this part.

Purpose

SEC. 722. The Commissioner shall (1) arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them of summer or regular session institutes consisting of courses in the counseling and guidance of students at the secondary school level with emphasis upon the counseling and guidance of gifted students, and (2) pay stipends under the provisions of this part to eligible persons who attend such institutes.

Contract Authority

SEC. 723. A contract with an institution of higher education under the provisions of this part shall provide for the payment to such institution of the reasonable cost incurred by it in providing the summer or regular session institute contracted for.

Stipends

SEC. 724. Any person employed in a public-school system who is employed or is to be employed in a guidance and counseling capacity on a full- or part-time basis and who enrolls in and attends a summer or regular session institute contracted for under this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute. Each such person with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance. However, no person shall receive a stipend under this title at a rate in excess of his last rate of salary for the immediately preceding academic year. Stipends under this section shall be paid only for periods during which the recipient is in attendance in good standing at the institute as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with its regularly prescribed standards and practices.

TITLE VIII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Appropriations authorized; functions of Commissioner

SEC. 801. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner, through grants or contracts, to—

(1) make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication by State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education in providing education;

(2) conduct research, demonstrations, and experiments in the use of such media for such purposes;

(3) conduct research, demonstrations, and experiments in the development and use of new media of communication (and other audio-visual aids) for such purposes;

(4) evaluate and publish reports concerning the effectiveness of such media for such purposes; and

(5) prepare and publish abstracts and catalogs of audio-visual materials available for such purposes to the extent such abstracts or catalogs are not otherwise readily available; and

to enable him to provide, upon request, advice, counsel, and technical assistance to State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize such media of communication in providing education.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Administration

SEC. 901. (a) In administering this act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U. S. C., sec. 5), of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

(b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report a full report of the activities under this act, including recommendations for needed revisions in its provisions.

(c) The Secretary shall advise and consult with the heads of executive departments and independent establishments of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs, with a view to the full coordination of all specialized scholarship, fellowship, and other educational programs administered by or under all departments and establishments of the Federal Government with the programs established by this act.

Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies

SEC. 902. (a) For the purpose of assisting the States to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of educational statistics provided by State and local reports and records and the methods and techniques for collecting and processing educational data and disseminating information about the condition and progress of education in the States, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, for grants to States under this section, such sums as the Congress may determine.

(b) Grants under this section by the Commissioner shall be equal to one-half of the

cost of State educational agency programs to carry out the purposes of this section, including (1) improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of statistical data supplied by local educational units, (2) the development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve as guides for local educational units, (3) the conduct of conferences and training for personnel of local educational units and of periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for records and reports, (4) improving methods for obtaining, from other State agencies within the State, educational data not collected by the State educational agency, or (5) expediting the processing and reporting of statistical data through installation and operation of mechanical equipment. The total of the payments to any State under this section for any fiscal year may not exceed \$50,000.

(c) Payments with respect to any program of a State educational agency under this section may be made (1) only to the extent it is a new program or an addition to or expansion of an existing program, and (2) only if the State plan approved under subsection (d) includes such program.

(d) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for purposes of this section if such plan—

(1) provides that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for carrying out programs under the plan either directly or through arrangements with other agencies of the State;

(2) sets forth the program proposed to be carried out under the plan and the general policies to be followed in doing so;

(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this section; and

(4) provides for the making of such reports to the Commissioner in such form and containing such information as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this section.

Disapproval of, and failure to comply with, State plans

SEC. 903. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the agency administering a State plan approved under one of the titles of this act, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this act governing its original approval, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall suspend approval of the State plan, and shall notify the agency administering the plan of the suspension. When approval of a State plan has been suspended by the Commissioner such approval shall remain suspended until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

(c) (1) While approval of a State plan submitted under title II is suspended by the Commissioner he shall not award new scholarships to individuals certified to him by the State Commission (or the Commissioner, in his discretion, may provide that the State Commission will not be eligible to participate in the part of a program under the title, or

in the part of the State plan, which is affected by the failure to comply).

(2) While approval of a State plan submitted under title IV, part A of title VII, or section 902 is suspended by the Commissioner he shall make no further payments under that title, part, or section (as the case may be) for programs in the State.

Judicial review

SEC. 904. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of a State plan submitted under this act, or with respect to his final action under section 903 (b), such State may, within 60 days after notice of such action, file in the United States district court for the district in which the capital of the State is located, a petition to review such action. The petition for review shall (1) contain a concise statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based and (2) designate that part of the Commissioner's decision sought to be reviewed.

(b) Notification of the filing of the petition for review shall be given by the clerk of the court by mailing a copy of the petition to the Commissioner.

(c) No costs or docket fees shall be charged or imposed with respect to any judicial review proceedings, or appeal therefrom, taken under this act.

(d) Upon receipt of the petition for review the Commissioner shall, within 20 days thereafter, certify and file in the court the record on review, consisting of the complete transcript of the proceedings before the Commissioner. No party to such review shall be required, by rule of court or otherwise, to print the contents of such record filed in the court.

(e) The court after review may dismiss the petition or deny the relief prayed for, or may suspend, modify, or set aside, in whole or in part, the action of the Commissioner, or may compel action unlawfully withheld. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review as provided in section 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Method of payment

SEC. 905. Payments under this act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Administrative appropriations authorized

SEC. 906. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this act.

Acceptance of gifts and bequests

SEC. 907. The Commissioner is authorized to accept gifts, grants, bequests, or devises for carrying out the provisions of this act.

Allotments to Territories and possessions

SEC. 908. The National Defense Scholarships reserved by the Commissioner under section 205 (a), and the amounts reserved by the Commissioner under sections 402 and 702 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs for the type of assistance furnished under the part or title in which the section appears.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 909. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may appoint an advisory committee, or advisory committees, to advise and consult with him with respect to the administration of titles V, VI, and VII of this act. Members of an advisory committee appointed under this section, while attending conferences or meetings of the

committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$50 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(b) Any member of an advisory committee appointed under this section is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U. S. C., sec. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (c) of this section.

(c) The exemption granted by subsection (b) shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

(2) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of 2 years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

Mr. ELLIOTT (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. AYRES of Ohio: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"Short title

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Higher Education Loan Guaranty Program of 1958.'

"Definitions

"SEC. 2. As used in this act—

"(1) the term 'State' means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

"(2) the term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which (A) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (B) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (C) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a 2-year program, which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (D) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (E) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For the purposes of clause (E) the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which shall be deemed to be the only such agencies or associations so recognized for the purposes of such clause;

"(3) the term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education;

"(4) the term 'person' means any corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, or individual;

"(5) the term 'secondary school' means a public school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12; and

"(6) the term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of elementary schools or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

"TITLE I—STUDENT LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM

"Legal powers and responsibilities

"SEC. 101. (a) With respect to matters arising by reason of this title and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Commissioner may—

"(1) sue on behalf of the United States and be sued in his official capacity in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal;

"(2) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to time of payment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or security, of the provisions of any note, contract, mortgage, or other instrument evidencing or securing a loan which has been guaranteed under this title;

"(3) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such guaranty; and

"(4) enforce, pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption;

"(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations, arising by reason of this title—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act;

"(2) maintain an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act; except that the financial transactions of the Commissioner including the settlement of claims under this title, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

"Limitations on guaranty of individual loans

"SEC. 102. (a) No loan or loans made to any student by one or more persons in excess of \$4,000 shall be guaranteed under this title.

"(b) Any loan guaranteed under this title shall be guaranteed in an amount not exceeding 60 percent of the unpaid balance of such loan, including any interest thereon accrued at the time of default.

"Eligibility of student borrowers and terms of loans

"SEC. 103. (a) Any student shall be eligible for a loan which may be guaranteed under this title if an institution of higher education certifies (1) that such student is in full-time attendance at such institution as an undergraduate student and has not been granted a baccalaureate (or equivalent) degree, (2) that such student is a citizen of the United States, (3) that such student, in the opinion of such institution, is capable of maintaining good standing in the undergraduate studies being pursued by him, and (4) the amount which, in the opinion of such institution, is needed by such student

in order to continue his undergraduate studies at such institution.

"(b) A loan to a student which is guaranteed under this title may be made by any person, but such a loan cannot be in an amount in excess of that certified with respect to such student pursuant to paragraph (4) of subsection (a) and must be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which (1) provides for repayment of the principal amount of such loan and interest thereon in periodic installments beginning 4 years from the date on which the student ceases to devote essentially full time to educational work in attendance at any institution of higher education, (2) requires full repayment of the principal with interest within 7 years after the date on which the first installment of principal becomes due, (3) provides for interest on all unpaid balances of principal at a per annum rate not exceeding 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ percent, (4) entitled the student borrower at his option to accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan without thereby accelerating the effective date of any rate of interest higher than the rate which would be payable in the absence of such acceleration, and (5) contains such other terms and conditions consistent with the provisions of this title and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this Act as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan.

"Certificates of guaranty—effective date of guaranty"

"SEC. 104. (a) If, upon application by any person made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the applicant has made a loan to an eligible student borrower which may be guaranteed under the provisions of this title, he shall issue to such applicant a certificate of guaranty covering such loan and setting forth the amount and terms of such guaranty.

"(b) A guaranty evidenced by a certificate of guaranty issued pursuant to subsection (a) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of such certificate; except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans submitted by any person, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a) by such person, the certificate of guaranty may be issued effective as of the date when the loan to be covered by such guaranty is made.

"(c) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall contain an agreement by the applicant that if the loan is covered by a guaranty under this title the applicant will submit such supplementary reports and statements during the effective period of the guaranty, upon such forms, at such times, and containing such information as the Commissioner may by or pursuant to regulation prescribe.

"(d) The rights of any person arising under a guaranty evidenced by a certificate of guaranty issued under this section may be assigned by such person to any other person.

"(e) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the guaranty of the United States. Upon surrender of the original certificates of guaranty in such cases, the Commissioner may issue a new certificate of guaranty in accordance with this section upon such consolidated obligation.

"Procedure on default of a student borrower"

"SEC. 105. (a) Upon default in payment of principal or interest due upon any loan covered by a guaranty issued pursuant to this title before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or

other enforcement proceeding upon the loan or upon any security for such loan, the guaranty beneficiary shall promptly notify the Commissioner who shall thereupon, if requested by such beneficiary or on his own motion, if the guaranty is still in effect, pay to the beneficiary, within the limits of liability specified in section 102 (b), the amount of the loss sustained by such beneficiary upon such loan as soon as such amount has been determined. The "amount of the loss" on any loan shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be an amount equal to the unpaid balance of the loan, including interest accrued and unpaid on the date of payment by the United States on its guaranty obligation pursuant to subsection (b), except that where the Commissioner has decided to make payment on his own motion the amount of loss as so determined shall be deemed tentative and shall be increased by the excess, if any, over such tentative amount of any net recovery made by the Commissioner on such loan or security thereafter after deduction of the cost of such recovery (including reasonable administrative costs).

"(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the guaranteed portion of the loss, or tentative amount of loss, pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation upon the guaranteed loan and be entitled to an assignment of the note or other evidence of the insured loan and any security therefor by the guaranty beneficiary.

"(c) Nothing in this title shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the guaranteed loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude forbearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the guaranteed obligation after payment on such guaranty.

"(d) Nothing in this title shall be construed to excuse the guaranty beneficiary from exercising, in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this title, the same care and diligence which would reasonably be used in making and collecting loans not guaranteed. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a guaranty beneficiary, finds that such beneficiary has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence, or to make the reports and statements required under section 104 (c), he shall disqualify such beneficiary for further guaranty on loans which (but for this subsection) could be guaranteed under this title until he is satisfied that such failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that such beneficiary will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may be.

"(e) As used in this section, the term "guaranty beneficiary" means the person guaranteed or its assignee, if the certificate of guaranty is held by such assignee.

"Appropriations authorized"

"SEC. 105. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to pay claims arising under this title and to administer its provisions.

"TITLE II—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS"

"Appropriations authorized"

"SEC. 201. For the purpose of assisting State educational agencies to strengthen science education in secondary schools, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, the sum of \$10 million.

"Allotment"

"SEC. 202. The sum appropriated pursuant to section 201 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States on the basis of

their relative numbers of students graduating from the 12th grade for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to the Commissioner.

"State plans"

"SEC. 203. The Commissioner shall approve, for the purposes of this title, a State plan which—

"(1) provides for administration of the plan by the State educational agency;

"(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State under this title will be expended by it, or granted by it to local boards of education, solely for one or more of the following:

"(A) to employ additional qualified teachers of science in secondary schools,

"(B) to increase the rate of compensation of teachers of science in secondary schools,

"(C) to acquire laboratory and other special equipment, including audiovisual materials and equipment and printed materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, for use in secondary schools;

"(3) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan; and

"(4) provides that the State educational agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this title.

"Payments to States"

"SEC. 204. From each State's allotment under section 202 the Commissioner shall from time to time during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, pay to such State the amount necessary to carry out its State plan approved under section 203."

Mr. AYRES (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman, is the gentleman's amendment the same as his bill, H. R. 13582?

Mr. AYRES. That is correct, with one change.

Mr. PATMAN. What is the change?

Mr. AYRES. The change is on line 3, page 5. The figure "\$2,000" has been stricken and the figure "\$4,000" inserted in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which I had planned to offer to section 201 of title II of the Elliott bill. Unless I hear the reading of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, I would not know where to offer that amendment to his proposed amendment. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio whether the titles of his bill follow the titles of the Elliott bill?

Mr. AYRES. There are two titles to this amendment, I will say to the gentlewoman from Illinois. Her amendment would come in title I.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, if I offered an amendment to title I of the bill, it would be impossible for me to give

the page and line, and in that case, would such an amendment be received?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no knowledge of the amendment the gentlewoman proposes to offer.

Mrs. CHURCH. Would it be possible to introduce the amendment without specifying the page and line?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot advise the gentlewoman on that at this point.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. May the gentlewoman offer her amendment to the substitute at this point or after the substitute is passed upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute will be open for amendment at any point.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES?]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like the gentleman to tell us, if the amendment is not to be read, what is the difference if the gentleman's amendment is accepted?

Mr. AYRES. I shall be glad to do that. I intended to do that as soon as my unanimous-consent request had been passed upon. At this time I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that my substitute has two titles. Title I is strictly a loan provision patterned after the GI guaranteed housing program. The student receives a certificate of admission from a school to which he wishes to go. Through the Commissioner he is given a maximum of \$4,000 for the 4-year period.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong this discussion but ask in just what particular is the gentleman's substitute different from the bill?

Mr. AYRES. I have only a loan provision and a \$10 million grant, but it is based on the percentage of high-school students graduating last year, to be used in the field of science.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman a copy of his amendment so that the gentlewoman from Illinois can learn where she may offer her amendment?

Mr. AYRES. There are copies at the desk, and it was explained in some detail yesterday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, all of us on the Committee on Education and Labor are concerned with the problems confronting our high-school graduates who find it financially difficult to attend college. However, in view of the large number of scholarships and fellowships that have been available and are available, I did not feel it was necessary for the Federal Government to get into the business of granting scholarships. I did feel, however, that if we

have, and we do have, many high-school graduates who are brilliant, who come from poor families and from large families and who do need some financial assistance, something should be done for them.

All my amendment does its this: A prospective student applies to the school of his choice. If the school thinks he is qualified to enter that school, then he can borrow up to \$4,000 over the 4-year period. This loan is guaranteed under the same provisions as are the GI-guaranteed housing loans. We know that in that program the percentage of default has been less than 1 percent.

We are dealing here with the highest type of individual graduate from our high schools, who will be asking for these loans. Based on the past operation of scholarships, we know they are a good risk. In fact, in checking with some of the largest universities and colleges around the country who now offer scholarships I find that they have discovered that they get about 20 percent more back from the student who attended the school on a scholarship than they originally gave him in the first place, without any obligation at all except perhaps a moral obligation because the university helped him.

The other thing is, these loans will not all be made by banks. There will be many private corporations that will be very happy to lend this money to a prospective student, who in time will be a graduate, because if a corporation has this contact with a student, if it is the one who loaned him the money, and he is a good chemical engineer or a good mechanical engineer, he in turn probably will be more inclined to go to work for that company that has assisted him.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I notice this 60 percent guaranty of the unpaid balance. That means during the time the student is in school, for instance 4 years, it is not repayable. At the end of the 4-year period, you start in 4 years. That makes 8 years. Then it must be repaid in 7 years. That makes 15 years. Interest is accumulating all the time. A person gets back his guaranteed part, 60 percent, at the end of the 15 years, if worse comes to worst, but of course he would get back more than his original loan anyway, would he not?

Mr. AYRES. Based on the GI loan program, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, we know that very, very few of these loans ever reach their maturity. Also, based on the repayment without any obligation by those students who have received scholarships from universities now, we know that one of the first things they want to do is pay back, in this instance, what they do not even owe. So based on past experience, I feel that these loans are going to be paid off long before the final deadline.

Mr. Chairman, in title II there is a direct grant of \$10 million to be given to the States. There again it is based on a percentage of high-school graduates. It is stipulated what this money

can be used for. It can be used to employ additional qualified teachers of science in secondary schools; to increase the rate of compensation of teachers in secondary schools; and to acquire laboratory and other special equipment, including audio-visual materials and equipment and printed materials other than textbooks suitable for use in providing education in science for use in secondary schools. I think this is a step in the right direction. Mr. Chairman, it gives the student who does not have the finances to carry on his college education a chance to get the money. It also gives the Congress an opportunity to make a grant to a State in this field of science both for teachers and equipment, and we, in turn, will be able to determine whether the States are really interested in receiving assistance from the Federal Government.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. Would the gentleman accept the Powell antidiscrimination amendment to be added to his substitute amendment at the proper place? I have my amendment at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. AYRES. Could we have the amendment read?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Which amendment is it? Is it last year's Powell amendment?

Mr. POWELL. No; it is the anti-discrimination amendment which I have already talked about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this substitute is good legislation—it might well be—I do not know it. The gentleman from Ohio claims that this was explained carefully yesterday. I might say to the members of the committee that the committee's legislation is based on hearing more than 200 witnesses. It is based on almost innumerable executive sessions of the joint subcommittees working on it. The committee's legislation is a well constituted and carefully drafted bill. The substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio contains a student loan guaranty program which, in principle, of course, is acceptable because we have it in the committee's legislation in a more polished and sounder form. I notice in the substitute offered by the gentleman, there are sections which are vague with respect to the powers of the United States Commissioner of Education and which would, in my opinion, give him greater powers and a greater right to intrude than he would have under the committee bill. As a matter of fact, we have eliminated any consideration of power in the committee bill. The gentleman says that no loan or loans made to any student by one or more persons, in excess of \$2,000 shall be guaranteed under this title. Now, anyone who is as familiar as the gentleman should be with the principle involved in this legis-

lation knows that \$2,000 will not come close to meeting the needs. I realize, of course, there are Members of the House who believe that in order to enable their children to get an education, a parent ought to take the shoes off the feet of the children and make them walk 8 or 10 miles and suffer all sorts of privation and that that is a fine and great historical concept. Of course, we still have great reverence for the log cabin and for the barefoot boy. But, I might remind the Members of the committee that city streets are a little hot at some times and a little cold at other times. Bare feet are not quite as comfortable on hot asphalt and concrete pavements as they might have been on the cool green grass and soft earth of a country road.

I think the committee should, if there are available to them copies of the substitute, get it and read it; and if there is time in this debate and if the committee wants to ignore the fact that this has not received thorough consideration, we might take a shot in the dark, then they might consider supporting the substitute.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Is the gentleman's understanding the same as mine, that the gentleman's substitute is for the entire bill and would wipe out all of the other provisions?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Therefore, it pays no attention at all to the other fine work done by the committee. Certainly I think it is important that every Member understands that this is not a substitute for just one part of the bill, but a substitute for the whole bill.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. If the gentleman would like to offer an amendment to the substitute, he would have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does the gentleman suggest he would accept a substitute which would include all of the titles which the gentleman seeks to eliminate in this substitute?

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman from Ohio is not making a statement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not see why we should take up the time of the House putting back into the bill the things that are already in the bill, and which make it an excellent increase.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We have an excellent bill, in the first place, a carefully considered bill; a thoroughly studied bill, based on the testimony of more than 200 witnesses. This substitute for all I know, could be a good bill, but it is like buying a pig in a poke.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It seems to me that the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], is totally inadequate, as has been brought

out. This would substitute for all of the provisions of the bill we have been considering, one inadequate guaranteed loan section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] has expired.

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], who offers the substitute, is the same gentleman who last year supported the bill on school construction. It seems a little strange that this year he should present to us an amendment that would first clearly gut the bill and destroy the bill; and, second, his amendment wipes out the very provisions of the Eisenhower proposals, both in the State of the Union message and in special messages which the President recommended to this House.

Mr. AYRES. Did the gentleman support the school construction bill?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. No. I opposed the gentleman last year.

Mr. AYRES. Then you are not criticizing me?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am not criticizing you. I am saying that the philosophy of this scholarship bill and this loan bill apparently does not appeal to the gentleman, but the school-construction bill does. That is the difference between us.

Mr. AYRES. My amendment does appeal to the gentleman?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. One phase of the gentleman's amendment does; but, as pointed out by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the rest of the bill is gutted. Now let us face the facts. The Ayres amendment destroys the bill. Those who are against the bill will support his amendment. Those who are for the bill are going to oppose the Ayres amendment. We should face up to it now without spending the afternoon arguing about it.

One other point. It seems unfortunate that Members on my side of the aisle would take the Ayres amendment, which has the teacher's salary provision. It is my side of the aisle which is most vociferous on the question of control of education. Now the Ayres amendment proposes that the Federal Government start paying teachers' salaries.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. I know the gentleman does not want to leave the impression that he is against an increase in teachers' salaries.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am opposed to the Federal Government's subsidizing teachers' salaries. I am surprised that the gentleman is for it.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. I think he has put his finger on what philosophically is a very radical departure and development in this proposal, and that it is a much more radical departure in Federal aid than the

committee had in mind. The gentleman agrees with that.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Absolutely. Once the Federal Government gets into the field of teachers' salaries we really are in for it. Certain people who will support the amendment will do so, as we see so often on the floor of this House, on an emotional basis.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. An amendment was proposed a year ago on the school-construction bill by the gentleman from Ohio and we said it is a question of good will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. And energy.

Mr. UDALL. The amendment was really a bill which had been processed by the committee and which only had a different distribution formula, but the proposition now presented to the Committee has never been presented to the committee, it is an entirely new proposal.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is the gentleman suggesting that this is here only as a method to kill the bill?

Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman's amendment provides a subsidy in the form of increase of salaries for science teachers.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Politically that is a very good thing to do.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I wonder how the teachers of English, history, and other subjects feel about it?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. Let us not imply that the Federal Government is doing this. The Federal Government gives the money to the State and the State does with it what the State wants to. The Federal Government has no control over it whatsoever.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I quite agree. I think the gentleman's proposal that the Federal Government subsidize teachers' salaries will have a bad effect. The Federal Government should stay out of this field. Once the Federal Government starts paying teachers' salaries or building schools, we are in it for life.

(Mr. WAINWRIGHT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Ayres substitute. As I read the substitute, there are only two provisions in it. The first one is the guaranty loan provision to the students, which, as written, will not be of any benefit. The other provision provides \$10 million for science instruction to be distributed among the States. The money authorized by the science provision is not allocated to the States on the basis of need.

This substitute has no scholarship or any equipment provision. The scholarship and loan provisions in H. R. 13247 received months of study. Naturally, there are defects in the bill, but we do bring before the Committee a program. The amendment of the gentleman from

Ohio would completely destroy this program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the equipment provision in the Elliott bill and the necessity for this particular provision. Half of our high schools offer no foreign-language courses. Less than 15 percent of our high-school students and not more than 15 percent of our college students study any foreign language. At a time when the Soviet Union confronts us everywhere in the world and in outer space, only nine public schools in the United States teach Russian. Less than 1 percent of our high-school students study German.

The Office of Education information indicates that only 1 out of 3 high-school students studies chemistry, 1 out of 4 studies physics, and only 1 out of 8 studies trigonometry or solid geometry. Only 57 percent of our high schools offer a course in physics, and nearly 20 percent of our high schools offer neither physics nor chemistry. Let us look at it another way. In the fall of 1956, there were about 61,000 high school seniors in schools which offered no physics or chemistry. There were about 100,000 seniors in schools offering no advanced mathematics.

Now these are only figures, but I say they are frightening figures. Reliable reports on education in the Soviet Union—by way of contrast—indicate that 40 percent of Russian schoolchildren study English and that every high-school student must study 4 years of science and 4 years of mathematics.

Mr. Chairman, I have a fact sheet here that has been worked up which I would like to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. This fact sheet shows the percentage of our high schools offering certain mathematics courses, science courses, and the average estimated cost of laboratory equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, we do contend that there is great need for this legislation just as there was need for the Smith-Hughes Act at the time of its enactment during World War I. Many of the high schools throughout the Nation need the matching funds that this bill provides in connection with laboratory equipment and facilities for general science, mathematics, biology, physics and chemistry. The annual \$60 million authorization for equipment as included in the Elliott bill will be disbursed on the basis of need with per capita income as the guide. The science labs, those who most need the equipment, will obtain the major share of this fund.

We realize, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is not going to solve all the problems of education. It is not going to result overnight in raising our standards in mathematics and science. But it is going to provide some practical assistance to our schools so that 10 or 15 years from now we can be meeting the needs that will have to be met.

In closing, I want to reiterate that the provisions of the Elliott bill deserve the support of this committee. This Congress should make some provision to promote the neglected subjects in our high schools which are absolutely essential to our general welfare.

The passage of the Elliott bill will be a great landmark. I feel the provisions in this bill bring about greater results than those provided in the Smith-Hughes Act at the time of its enactment.

Mr. Chairman, the Ayres substitute, H. R. 13582, should be defeated.

FACT SHEET—SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Number of secondary schools in the United States.....	26,316
Numbers of teachers in public secondary schools:	
Science	65,000
Mathematics	65,000
Modern foreign languages.....	15,000

Percent of high schools offering certain mathematics courses

Course:	Percent of schools
General mathematics (9th grade) ..	75.1
Elementary algebra.....	91.9
Plane geometry.....	81.2
Intermediate algebra.....	63.3
Solid geometry.....	27.2
Plane trigonometry.....	33.4
Other mathematics.....	18.5

Percent of high schools offering certain science courses

Course:	Percent of schools
General science.....	85.3
Biology.....	90.3
Chemistry	63.8
Physics	56.8
Neither physics nor chemistry.....	18.2

Average estimated costs of laboratory equipment for various science rooms (does not include apparatus or instruments)¹

General science.....	\$6,000
Biology.....	6,700
Physics.....	9,600
Chemistry.....	12,600
Preparation rooms (2).....	2,900
Total.....	37,800

Average estimated costs of high school laboratory apparatus and supplies¹

General science.....	\$1,245-\$4,335
Biology	3,235- 8,240
Physics	3,475- 8,925
Chemistry	4,450- 7,200

¹ Source of estimates: Scientific Apparatus Makers Association in cooperation with the School Facilities Council.

STATES WITH CONSULTANTS OR SUPERVISORS

Science (full time): Seven States—Connecticut, Georgia, Louisiana, New York, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin.

Mathematics (full time): Two States—New York and Texas. (NOTE.—Texas position now vacant.)

Science and mathematics (combined): Two States—North Carolina and Pennsylvania.

Foreign language (full time): Three States—Georgia, New Mexico, and New York.

Special county or city supervisors or consultants of science are available to only 6 percent of the schools.

Special city or county supervisors or consultants of mathematics are available to only 5 percent of the schools.

Language enrollments in public secondary schools, 1890, 1922, and 1955

Year	Course	Percent
1890	Modern foreign languages.....	16.3
	Latin.....	34.7
1922	Modern foreign languages.....	27.4
	Latin.....	27.5
1955	Modern foreign languages.....	13.7
	Latin.....	6.9

Of all public high schools in the United States (as of 1957), 56.4 percent offered no modern foreign language instruction to their students.

Percentages of public high schools offering modern foreign languages

Connecticut, Maine, New Jersey, Rhode Island.....	100.0
California.....	97.6
Massachusetts.....	95.2
New Hampshire.....	94.6
Delaware.....	94.1
Arizona.....	88.3
Vermont.....	87.3
New York.....	87.1
Virginia.....	83.0
North Carolina.....	80.1
Maryland.....	75.5
Nevada.....	75.0
Washington.....	72.6
District of Columbia.....	70.6
New Mexico.....	66.7
South Carolina.....	64.7
Michigan.....	58.1
Wyoming.....	56.3
Illinois.....	54.4
Pennsylvania.....	54.3
Ohio.....	49.9
Colorado.....	49.1
Florida.....	45.3
Georgia.....	42.4
West Virginia.....	39.5
Texas.....	39.4
Oregon.....	38.4
Idaho.....	33.3
Utah.....	32.9
Louisiana.....	26.7
Tennessee.....	26.6
Indiana.....	24.5
Alabama.....	23.0
Minnesota.....	22.9
Missouri.....	21.8
Montana.....	21.3
Kentucky.....	19.5
Kansas.....	19.3
Mississippi.....	18.1
Arkansas.....	12.9
Oklahoma.....	10.1
Nebraska.....	9.9
Iowa.....	8.3
South Dakota.....	7.6
North Dakota.....	4.4

(Source: The National Interest and Foreign Languages, revised edition, January 1957.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just had the opportunity to look this amendment over as offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]. Essentially his amendment is the loan section. What is the difference between the Ayres loan section and the loan section in the regular bill? Fundamentally, it departs from the basic objective of the loan section which we had originally developed and brought before the House here today. It does this in this respect. It was our hope by author-

izing \$1,000 a year with a maximum limitation of \$5,000 to provide the opportunity for a boy to get a college education through a loan. It is big enough and it is long enough to do the job of getting a college education. The Ayres substitute does not do that. It is limited to \$2,000. That, to me, is a basic, a fundamental difference. In H. R. 13247 we are trying to make it possible for boys to get a college education through the regular loan section of this bill.

There are minor defects in it, too. For instance, if the boy dies or is permanently disabled he is not forgiven the loan. H. R. 13247 takes care of this, the Ayres amendment does not.

The interest rate is $4\frac{3}{4}$ percent, with the banks guaranteeing 60 percent. I do not know whether you can get money from the banks that way. I am a director of a bank and I doubt very much if the banks are going to loan its money. There are people with more experience in banking than I who may differ, but there is a good deal of question whether the students would be able to obtain that kind of money from the banks.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. However, the gentleman will find that I testified that some of the small loan companies are now going into this very area.

Mr. HASKELL. I hope they do.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do, too. But I think with a little encouragement along the line of a guaranteed loan plan they would do it so that the money would be available.

Mr. HASKELL. I think the gentleman is probably correct. But the basic point is that this is such a minor effort in AYRES' amendment as compared with the 1 that we are offering to provide a college education through a loan system, that the 2 are not even comparable.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. Does the gentleman think that with the Government guaranteeing these loans, as the amendment provides, that corporations and individuals will not make loans to students?

Mr. HASKELL. For 60 percent of the money.

Mr. GWINN. Various persons interested in youth and education besides banks would make these loans, with that kind of government guaranty?

Mr. HASKELL. I think it is very possible and very likely that banking institutions in many areas would fail to loan the money with a 60 percent guaranty.

Mr. GWINN. This is not confined to banking institutions.

Mr. HASKELL. Or any other loaning institution.

Mr. GWINN. Any person, any parent could make the loans.

Mr. HASKELL. Any other loaning agency; that is my opinion.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman for the tremendous part which he has played in the committee in developing a sound loan title in the bill. If we were debating the relative merits of the guaranty program as proposed by the gentleman from Ohio and the particular title in this bill, we might have a basis for discussion at least. But the problem is that this substitute would emasculate the bill which we have been considering. It would eliminate all of the other titles. It is for that reason primarily that I think it should be voted down regardless whether there is some merit in the particular loan provision offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HASKELL. I thank the gentleman, and I would say this further. We had the loan guaranty idea in our original thinking. We did everything under the sun to develop a guaranteed loan program and get the interest rate low enough so that it would encourage the boys to take a loan out to obtain a higher education. We were unable to come up with it. We had a lot of people thinking about it in the executive branch and in the legislative branch of the Government. I do not believe that this idea as expressed in the Ayres amendment is anything but a casual gathering together of a loan section. I hope that Members on my side of the aisle, as well as on the other side of the aisle, will vote against the Ayres substitute.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Did the committee have before it representatives from the Veterans' Administration who are experienced with the GI bill in financing education, because this is an identical provision?

Mr. HASKELL. We contacted those people.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Is there testimony available?

Mr. HASKELL. I do not believe it will be found in the testimony, but if the gentleman wants to see the record of our lengthy meetings with people from these various branches of the Government, I should be glad to talk to the gentleman about it.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL to the amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: On page 5, line 20, after the word "person," insert "without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, or sex."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman asked me before whether I would accept the amendment. I would be happy to accept it.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. May I observe that under present regulations issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare there is a provision that in the expenditure of Federal funds and in the administration of federally aided programs of education there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, or color. That is substantially what the gentleman's amendment provides.

This regulation was in those identical words a part of the regulations of the Office of Education prior to the creation of the secretaryship of Health, Education, and Welfare. We have had anti-discrimination regulations. If the gentleman believes there is need for his amendment in this legislation, certainly we can continue to carry on in the future, as in the past, these Federal-aid programs in accordance with the amendment the gentleman has offered. I feel that we on this side should accept the amendment.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman so much.

I am offering the amendment now only because if the substitute carries I should like to see this language in it. However, I am going to stand with my committee chairman and the committee on the Elliott bill as opposed to the Ayres bill, although the Ayres bill does have a lot of merit. Nevertheless, to me it just scratches the surface of the problem, while the Elliott bill goes into it much more deeply and with more lasting and profound effects.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GRIFFIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish first to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], who has worked so hard and so diligently in a very patient and non-partisan manner to bring this bill before us. He has done an outstanding job and deserves great credit.

As a junior Member on the minority side I have followed this bill closely and have worked on it with a great deal of interest. I might say that I am not completely satisfied with every aspect of the bill. I have been particularly interested in the student loan program, and I would like to address my remarks to that title of the bill as it would be affected by the so-called Ayres substitute amendment.

There are many Members who do not like the scholarship title but favor a sound student loan program. To them I say: do not vote for the Ayres substitute; it does not serve your purpose. The Ayres substitute, unfortunately, does not provide an adequate or a workable loan program.

If you are against Federal scholarships and wish to strike that title from the bill, hold your fire because I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] intends to offer just such an amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am happy to yield to my distinguished and able colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I am glad the distinguished gentleman has made this point. I am equally disturbed about the grant or scholarship section. I think those funds ought to be administered as loans rather than grants. I hope no one will vote for the Ayres amendment which is too drastic, thinking that it is the only way to eliminate what they believe to be an unsound part of the bill. Voting for the Ayres amendment would kill also the provisions that are sound, desirable, and needed. There will be an opportunity to strike out title II.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, a fellow member of the committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I compliment the gentleman from Michigan on the part he has played in developing a sound loan program in this bill. He may be a junior member of the committee, but he gave a lot of serious consideration to this title. His efforts were most helpful and the loan title, I am sure will bear the closest scrutiny.

Mr. GRIFFIN. From the very beginning I had hoped that this title could be drafted on a guaranteed loan basis. That was also the desire, I know, of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. McINTOSH] and my colleague from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL]. The three of us worked hard in an effort to develop a guaranteed loan program as a substitute for the title in the original Elliott bill.

But we found that a guaranteed loan program will not really work unless we are willing to allow the interest rate to seek its own level in commercial channels. The interest rate would have to be at least 6 percent, and probably higher, to be realistic.

I call your particular attention to two features of the Ayres substitute: the Federal guaranty would be only 60 percent, and the interest rate could not exceed 4¾ percent, of course the student's note would be unsecured. Now, if veterans, who have a house to mortgage a full Federal guaranty, cannot borrow money at 4¾ percent or even 5 percent, it is obvious that a poor college student would be able to borrow very little money in commercial channels at 4¾ percent on his unsecured note.

The Ayres substitute will do nothing in the student loan field and, in my opinion, a vote for the substitute would really constitute a vote against the loan program.

Under title III of the bill, each college or university will have an opportunity to supervise and administer a loan fund. The Federal Government will contribute 80 percent of the trust fund, but not to exceed \$250,000 for any one college in 1 year. That the college itself will administer the loan is a very important point, in my opinion.

Successful student loan programs have been managed and administered by the colleges. They are close to the problem

and they know who are the students who deserve these loans. We are not invading a field which the banks are serving to any extent. The banks are not, and could not be expected to make long-term, low-interest loans to college students on an unsecured basis.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. AYRES. The August 5 edition of the New York Times contains an article, "Loan Puts Sunshine in His Life" showing a student getting his loan from the banker. Throughout the State, according to the New York Higher Education Assistance Corporation 126 banks in 207 communities are participating in the student loan plan. The organization has guaranteed 260 loans in the first month, totaling \$141,000.

Mr. GRIFFIN. There are a few States in which limited guaranty programs are now working. Their growth should be encouraged. The State of Massachusetts is an outstanding example.

But you will find that the interest rate is too high, that the term is not long enough in most cases, and that the number of student borrowers is relatively small compared to the impact which this program could have.

I envision that the loan program in this bill will go a long way toward filling a gap which was left by the termination of the GI bill. This loan title should help to make it possible for every qualified student with the will to find a way to go to college.

I urge my colleagues to vote down the AYRES substitute and to support the loan title in the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

The amendment to the substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out there are several inconsistencies in the Ayres amendment. This amendment was not presented to the committee nor was it considered. But, many of the things that are contained in the amendment were considered by the committee. For example, there is the provision for the allocation of these funds. It is on a per capita basis. Last year, the gentleman from Ohio came in here and one of the criticisms that he had of the school-construction bill was that funds were not allocated on a need basis. He got up here and told us that the President wanted a bill with the allocation on a need basis. Yet, today he tells us that the allocation of these funds should be on a per capita basis.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will not the gentleman admit that in any stu-

dent-loan proposition you have need to start with? It is an entirely different thing than a school-construction proposition because obviously no one is going to borrow money if they have to pay for it if they do not need it for their education.

Mr. METCALF. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri and I think the gentleman from Missouri will agree also that there is need for school construction everywhere to start with. But, the point I am making is that the President for whom the gentleman from Ohio was speaking last year wanted a need program then and he wants a needy program this year.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. METCALF. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The point is in regard to school construction that you do not have the same kind of approach on that and the need test has to be applied at a higher level. When we talk about a student loan being on a need basis, obviously, no student is going to come in and ask to borrow money when he already has it.

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

I think the gentleman realizes that when you are talking about increasing the number of science teachers, increasing the pay for those teachers, and laboratory equipment, you are just giving it on the number of students they have.

Mr. METCALF. This proposal in the substitute bill is the most outrageous invasion of local supervision of schools and school administration that has been presented on this floor. Many of us feel there should be a general grant to help teachers' salaries, such as we have for operation and maintenance in Public Law 874, but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] has not presented this kind of grant. He has said this shall be used to increase the compensation of teachers of science. That will upset every salary schedule established by local school boards and administrators. The teachers themselves are opposed to these differentials for teachers of science as against teachers of mathematics or other subjects.

Mr. AYRES. Not if the qualified science teachers stay in the school system. In my own community where we have a great demand for trained chemists, it is difficult to get a teacher to work for \$5,000 when he can go to one of the rubber companies and double his money.

Mr. METCALF. But the gentleman is going to have the Federal Government come in and set up special compensation over and above the salaries established by the school boards for a special type of teachers. That is an invasion of a matter that should be permanently in the hands of the local school board.

Mr. AYRES. The State does not have to accept any of the money if they do not want it. If they do not want to put it into teachers' salaries, they can put it into the laboratory equipment.

The problem is to get more trained people in the technical field.

Mr. METCALF. That is true. The gentleman's bill will not do a single thing to solve that problem. All it will do is to upset the present salary arrangements, upset the local administration of it. All of the experts who testified on this subject were unanimously against a salary differential for science teachers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has expired.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I am grateful for this opportunity to say a few words about this important measure. I regret to say I am opposed to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] because I do not understand it.

I do believe when our distinguished committee has spent months and months on the bill that we have before us we ought to give them every possible opportunity to explain this important measure and carry it through on the basis of the instruction they have already had.

I have been opposed to new Federal aid programs, for several reasons. One of the chief reason is I desperately fear the tentacles of the Federal Government will reach down into the school processes of every community in this Nation.

I worry about Federal aid to education, because the people at home are willing to pay for education. Once we take away from them this responsibility, the Jeffersonian conception of States rights, to which I cleave, is utterly a dead issue.

The lag is in training of scientists who pursue what may be considered the national interest. Rock and roll artists not needed—not writers—Wake Up Little Suzy, not engineers to work on fans of automobiles, not discounting the broad cultural fields. My bill is to create institutions like MIT. Look what we have done in the field of agriculture.

My State gives 1,000 teacher scholarships. I have never known an able student with the desire who failed to get his education.

Are we merely going to give scholarships, we need a standard of attainment. Certainly the Defense Department knows what is needed—Russian scholars—space scholars.

As the gentleman from Ohio just said, I think certainly the great emphasis on this program has been national defense, and I want to address myself for a moment to that phase of the bill. I want to add to the committee bill when we reach that point on page 11, after the word "school" the following language:

(4) Such person certifies that he will serve a minimum of 3 years in a civilian post or assignment which will best promote the national defense as specified by the Secretary of Defense; such service to be compensated for at a rate proportionate to that received by others of similar or comparable education and experience in the same field of activity.

That language pertains to title 2 of the bill, scholarships. I frankly admit that after Sputnik I reared its ugly head into the air I was worried; I still am. I am

not convinced that we do not have enough scientists and engineers in this country. The thing that worries me is that I do not think we have enough scientists and engineers in America in the best areas for the good of the Nation.

Somebody has said that if we had spent one-tenth of our engineering skill on putting a sputnik into the air that we put into the improvement of fins on automobiles we could have had a sputnik in the air years ago. Careful direction of effort is always important. We need it very much in our defense effort. Under the terms of the bill as it now stands we can not get that concentrated effort properly directed. The amendment I propose would bring us a tangible defense return from these scholarships. As the bill now stands a scholarship could be given for any subject, and it is supported by some on the ground that it provides opportunity for creative development. But here is a national defense bill. It should be designed in a positive way to aid our defense. The administrator in charge should be able to tell certain gifted students: "You are going to learn to speak Russian. We need people who can speak Russian." He should be able to say to another group: "You are going to learn to speak Spanish, for we need people who can speak Spanish."

A friend of mine from south of the border the other day said that if we could send people there who could even say "Como esta usted?" and "Hasta la vista," just a few words of Spanish, it would do more good than all the diplomats and dollars we are spending down there.

When we get to this portion of the bill, Mr. Chairman, I hope we will tie my amendment to this Title 2 for the national defense effort. If it is a defense effort, let us make it such.

Now, I want to say very sincerely that I have not made up my mind about this bill. I know I am one of many who is earnestly searching his soul to see if national defense is in such critical condition that this bill if enacted would help improve its condition. But I beg of you not to look upon this matter as a sort of St. Vitus dance, where we make our effort in all areas without any specific goals in mind. Where we have this great problem of national defense let us at least tie this Title 2 down to that approach.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am glad someone has spoken in support of the substitute amendment, for we have heard a lot against it.

The objectives of the bill are excellent. I doubt if there is anybody who disagrees with that statement. I also can sincerely join in the tribute paid to the committee for the study it has made in this very difficult area.

I am deeply disturbed, however, about the scholarship provisions and the general approach in the bill, I might say. The whole thing is the creation of a bureaucracy which, to me, is quite disturbing.

I see two areas where we need legislation. One is the area of student loans. As a matter of fact, I am satisfied that if we meet that we would be taking care of the greater amount of the problems that face us.

It has been pointed out that there is considerable difference between the Ayres proposal for a loan guaranty and the program proposed by the bill. Indeed, there is considerable difference.

That is one reason I am strongly behind the Ayres approach, because the approach in the bill will actually put the Federal Government in the business of administering and handling these loans, which means the creation of a bureaucracy. The approach that the gentleman from Ohio makes is not a new approach at all. It is a time tested approach. There probably is no one in the House who is more familiar than the gentleman from Ohio with the problems of administering Veterans' Administration types of loans, after the years of experience he has had on that committee. I think he was chairman of the subcommittee on VA housing loans in the 83d Congress.

Now, I ask the gentleman, am I correct in stating that the features of your lending program are on all fours, in fact, copied from the G. I. bill? Am I correct?

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman is correct. The language was written by one of the gentlemen who helped draft the original GI housing program. The interest rate is the same as that for the GI program and the guaranty arrangement is on the same basis. The only basic difference, is of course, that the student does not have any collateral, whereas the GI did. But, we feel that these men are of such high caliber that the risk there is very small.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I am sure the gentleman is conscious of the fact that the bill the Senate passed several years ago provided for supplementing teachers' salaries and for facilities for elementary and secondary public schools in the country, and much controversy arose over that. And, I am sure you are aware of the fact that in H. R. 13582 there is no formula based on need, and I have always understood that the President was in favor of it on the basis of need.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I might say to the gentleman in regard to title 2 I listened carefully to his comments. I happen to agree with that position. I do not favor the title 2 section, and I hope that that feature of the substitute will be knocked out. But, the point is that this is a substitute for a bill that I find so many more objectionable features in and it cuts out these features and confines itself primarily to the one area where I do think we can meet some problems.

Mr. PERKINS. Are you in favor of either the loan provision or the equipment provision?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. As far as that feature of this particular bill is

concerned, I wish it were not here; I am not in favor of it, because I think the balance, the loan provisions are so important, I would say the good outweighs the bad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

DEFEAT SUBSTITUTE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, certainly the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is a very fine, able, and sincere Member of Congress, and I am sure he did not intend to offer this substitute for the purpose of killing this bill. I certainly would not charge him with that. But, I really believe it will kill the bill if the substitute is adopted. It is an abbreviated proposal in comparison to the Elliott bill. It does not go near as far as we should go. Now, this is a dangerous vote, we should recognize it as a dangerous proposal. We know that as most if not all Members of this House who are opposed to this bill will vote for this substitute, not because they are for the substitute but on the theory of carrying their point in defeating the original bill or doing what is regarded as dividing and conquering.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we know that is usually done. It happens all the time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My very dear friend, why accuse us of an unwarranted motive? Can we not once in a while be decent and honest in our convictions? Why imply we have improper motives?

Mr. PATMAN. It is being honest and decent. It is being done all the time. We all do it. We do it in a way that will permit us to carry out our points.

This substitute provides for Federal aid to education. On page 11 of the substitute it provides "an increase in the rate of compensation of teachers of science in secondary schools." So, it is a Federal-aid-to-education bill.

We must recognize that many Members who are opposed to Federal aid to education will vote for this substitute, not because they are for Federal aid to education—they are against it—but because it will be against the interest of the bill which they would like to kill. I do not blame them for that. It is done all the time. It is no reflection on any Member. It is something we face, must consider, and try to overcome it.

Our committee has brought out this bill. It is a very fine committee. They have given careful consideration to this bill over a period of weeks and months and they heard over 200 witnesses. Are we going to substitute the judgment of one Member of this Congress, regardless of how fine and able and sincere he is, for the judgment of 30 members of the committee? We should not do that.

You know, when we go back home during vacation, or what we call a vacation—it is never a vacation—we address civic clubs, and we are always proud of the fact that we can say that every bill

that is put into the hopper goes to a committee; that the members of the committee sit and act as judges; that we hear the testimony of witnesses; that every bill is considered paragraph by paragraph, line by line, and word by word. We carefully consider it to make sure that we have everything in it that should be in it in order to carry out our objectives and to make sure that it does not have any harmful language or loopholes of any kind. After a bill is considered like that by a committee, then we take it to the floor of the House and usually the Members of the House support the committee because the committee has gone into the matter and carefully considered it.

But here is a case where the judgment of one Member—and I repeat, as fine a Member as he is—should not be substituted for the judgment of all the 30 members of this committee.

I really insist that if this substitute is adopted it will be tantamount to defeating the whole bill, and I hope the substitute is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BEAMER) there were—ayes 95, noes 18.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill and the approach to this problem are off on the wrong foot. I went to school and college at the turn of the century, when the proponents of this bill say that more scientists and mathematicians were turned out than are turned out today. Yet we have in the colleges now more than 30 times as many students as were attending the schools and colleges when I grew up and came along.

The trouble is that when my group were there the courses were laid out for us, and there were certain required courses which took up practically all of our time. Now it is practically all optional, and the students do not take up the things that need to be taken up.

This bill is not what is needed. What is needed is an attempt on the part of the colleges and the schools to make these students take the courses they need to take to be of real service to the United States.

The United States cannot afford to have any more spending. We have to conserve our resources, and we have to see that the people of the United States have a chance to survive, which they will not have if we go on spending money all the time over and over and over.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret there is evidence of a disposition

to cut off debate on this very important bill.

Mr. Chairman, once again, for the third successive year, I rise in opposition to a proposal for Federal aid to education.

In the previous two instances the relentless drive of the pressure groups and of the educational hierarchy of the National Education Association and its brood of affiliates was turned back in this House.

Today, as hitchhikers on sputnik, the advocates of a massive transfer to the Federal Government of reliance for financial support of public education are making a new, even bolder, even more desperate effort to establish the beachhead of Federal aid to education.

In the two previous years the drive was made under the guise of Federal assistance to the States for school construction. Today through the various proposals of this legislation for Federal grants and/or loans, these advocates of Federal aid propose to extend Federal activity and authority to the broad question of the qualitative character of public education.

Let us see just how far we have moved toward Federal control of educational policy in the short period of 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHANSEN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, the 1956 school construction bill contained this provision:

In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

Yet in this year's report of the Committee on Education and Labor, on this pending legislation, I read these startling words:

It is exceedingly important to maintain a balanced program of instruction in all fields. The committee does not desire that one field of training be developed at the expense of another. It is evident, however, that many of our elementary and secondary schools are not providing instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages of sufficient quality or quantity to meet today's increasing needs in these fields.

So now we in this Congress are undertaking to become experts in education. We are undertaking to legislate educational-financial policies for elementary and secondary schools which, by this very statement, presuppose value judgments with respect to educational policy, curriculum content and emphasis, quality of teaching and related matters.

How long are we to seek to maintain the farce that we are not exercising—or undertaking to exercise—Federal control of education in a most direct and significant fashion?

I am deeply disturbed—and I speak most respectfully—that the statement

released by the White House, and quoted on the floor of the House yesterday, indicates a still persistent faith that excursions into this proposed field of Federal activity can be made on a short-term, one-shot, emergency basis and that such activity can then be easily and readily turned off—like a water spigot. When the President spoke at a press conference a year ago of wanting Federal aid for school construction on such a temporary basis, and when he said that he then wanted it stopped, in his words, "if necessary by a constitutional amendment," I was hopeful of a growing awareness and concern that such a termination might not be a simple or assured thing. Nothing, it seems to me, is more clearly established than the fact that this sort of a temporary, emergency treatment is the farthest thing in the world from the hopes and intentions of the principal sponsors of Federal aid to education.

Turning to another matter, this is the third time in a little over a week that a legislative committee's members have volunteered a willingness to radically modify a bill in the desperate effort to persuade the House to consider the legislation. I commend the sharp criticism of this sort of legislative procedure voiced yesterday by the distinguished assistant minority leader [Mr. HALLECK]. I think it is time that the legislative committees desist in this practice of child abandonment.

Their action in this instance merely conforms my firm conviction that the purpose here is to get in the opening wedge of Federal aid to education. The very nature of a wedge—and that is what this is—is that it has to be shaved and whittled down to as thin and sharp an edge as necessary in order to achieve the initial entry. But let us not be deceived as to the use which will be made of the wedge once that entry is gained.

Mr. Chairman, when we go back into the House I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert, at the close of my remarks, two letters that came to me entirely unsolicited from Presidents of small, non-tax-supported colleges in my district. The writers of these letters are Dr. William W. Whitehouse, president of Albion College, Albion, Mich., and Dr. Weimer K. Hicks, president of Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich. These two splendid gentlemen, able, brilliant, dedicated men who are devoting their lives to the cause of free education, plead eloquently that Congress not take the step here contemplated. Are we to brush aside these and similar pleas and warnings?

Dr. Whitehouse says this, among other things:

If the Federal Government starts to go into scholarships on anything like a large basis, and that could very easily happen under the hysteria of the sputnik impact, then a lot of private foundations, corporations, and individuals are going to say also that this is a task being done by the Government.

And in the same vein, Dr. Hicks warns:

I believe it would be suicidal to our democratic way of life if we permit the Federal Government to take over this responsibility.

I direct the attention of my colleagues to the fact that only a few days ago this House expressed its opposition to the doctrine of automatic preemption of authority by the route of Federal legislation. We were dealing there with the judicial and legal aspects of Federal preemption. We are dealing here with a very practical type of Federal preemption against which there can be no legal or judicial protection. Presidents Whitehouse and Hicks have unerringly put their finger on this form of preemption so discouraging and fatal to the voluntarism of nongovernmental activity.

Mr. Chairman, we are—at least it is hoped—in the closing days of this session. Apropos of that fact and its bearing on our deliberations here today, I quote another comment from Dr. Whitehouse's letter:

Congress at this late date is apt to vote on a very impulsive basis with the idea in mind that adjournment is going to come and let's have full speed ahead to get as much done as possible.

I think this is an accurate analysis and a timely warning. Evidently Dr. Whitehouse has been reading the press reports from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, the letters to which I referred are as follows:

ALBION COLLEGE,
Albion, Mich., August 6, 1958.
Congressman AUGUST E. JOHANSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We understand that House bill H. R. 13247, having to do with Federal scholarships, has been cleared by the House Rules Committee and can come on the floor of Congress at any time now. Congress at this late date is apt to vote on a very impulsive basis with the idea in mind that adjournment is going to come and let's have full speed ahead to get as much done as possible. This is always a very dangerous mood, but is quite understandable in a democracy such as ours.

I know that I am speaking for our administrative staff here and for our trustees also, that Albion College is not in sympathy at all with the idea of Federal scholarships. Those of us who are greatly concerned with the rising costs of Federal Government, with the threatening inflationary rise with its disastrous effects on the bulwarks of our economy, and the general apathy of people in all classes who say let the Federal Government do it, would like to see a period written to this momentum of Federal aid. Practically all of our institution have scholarship funds established and the same goes for the tax-supported institutions so that we believe that it is only in rare cases that a gifted boy or girl cannot attend some institution of higher learning. Albion College, for example, this year placed a Rhodes scholar who was enabled to come to Albion because of a scholarship established by the church and who worked a great deal of his way through college and then went to medical school at the University of Michigan. If the Federal Government starts to go into scholarships on anything like a large basis, and that could very easily happen under the hysteria of the sputnik impact, then a lot of private foundations, corporations, and individuals are going to say also that this is a task being done by the Government. It is alarming to see the way we acquiesce in believing that our State capital and National Capital can do things more efficiently than local divisions of government and enterprise. After all, it is the

grassroots of America that have to pay the bill. There is a personalization in the control of scholarships that comes when they are localized, but too often is a large-scale system of scholarship distribution it takes on all the characteristics of a mass standardized movement.

Albion College limits its scholarships given out of its own funds to students who have high educational ability and achievement, plus the proven need for financial assistance. There are honorary recognitions, such as Phi Beta Kappa, that are given to all students as a reward for scholastic achievement and encouragement. In the Federal program, in all likelihood, the scholarship aid would be distributed without any regard for the recipient's family ability to pay his way. President Eisenhower's suggested loan program has much to commend it.

I want it understood that I am speaking only for our own institution and not for any organization in which I have membership or executive responsibilities because I believe that the boards of trustees of such organizations are to speak as a whole for the entire membership.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

W. W. WHITEHOUSE,
President.

KALAMAZOO COLLEGE,
Kalamazoo, Mich., August 1, 1958.
The Honorable AUGUST E. JOHANSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing in opposition to bill H. R. 13247, regarding Federal scholarships, which is coming before Congress in the near future. I am voicing strong protest against Federal aid to education in any form whatsoever. While I recognize that the American public must invest more heavily in higher education, I feel it will be suicidal to our democratic way of life if we permit the Federal Government to take over this responsibility. I believe that the support of higher education must be shared by the various States and by individuals and industry. To follow any other pattern will ultimately destroy our system of free enterprise.

The opinions which I express rather briefly in this letter are shared by the overwhelming majority of leaders of the independent colleges in America. While the voice of this group is not always as strong as the State-supported institution and the National Offices of Education, it is, nonetheless, the thought that permeates the majority of the citizens of our Nation. Your assistance in defeating this bill will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

WEIMER K. HICKS,
President.

What we were dealing with the other day was the legal and judicial aspects of that preemption. What we are dealing with today is something entirely different.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. Mr. UDALL and Mr. HOFFMAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Arizona, a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. UDALL. In opposition to the motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I was on my feet demanding recognition, and I am also a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. As far as the Chair is concerned, the Chair saw the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman

from Arizona, and the Chair has recognized the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I heard you.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I address my remarks to the pending business before the committee, the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]. I urge that that amendment be defeated.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that he is not addressing himself to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is talking on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN]. That motion opens the entire bill for debate. The gentleman from Arizona is in order.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] were directed toward the very basis of this legislation. Our committee has considered his strictures.

It is true, as many opponents of this legislation have stated today, there are other areas in the field of education where we have serious shortage. We know that there is a shortage of qualified teachers. And it is also agreed that our schools and colleges lack adequate housing. Last year our committee brought legislation addressed to the facilities problem to this floor and we were defeated. We have not had the temerity—because I think we sense the temper of this body—to again bring school construction legislation, much less aid for teachers' salaries legislation, before this Congress. In other words, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio goes much farther than the committee proposal now before you.

There are many amendments at the desk. I think this afternoon we can perfect this bill. I think I sense the atmosphere of this House. If we proceed I think we can perfect a bill that the majority of the Members will vote for. So let us move ahead and defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and frame a bill we can pass today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is happy to recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased with the great interest and response that this loan provision has brought forth in the House. But I want to emphasize that if you agree that a loan provision is good, if you want an effective loan provision, then take the committee provision. We spent considerable time on the guaranty approach. We ran into two problems. First of all, the estimated interest rate would be far higher than that provided in the Ayres substitute. Guaranteed loans would be comparable to the FHA home improvement loan, which requires a substantially higher servicing cost and

interest rate than the Ayres amendment provides for.

If you raise the interest rate and if you raise the guaranty provided in the substitute, it would then have limited effectiveness. Secondly, the substitute would require considerably higher administrative costs. That is obvious because the substitute requires the Federal Administrator to pass upon each individual loan, whereas under the committee system a loan fund is transferred to a trust fund administered by the college. Thus under the committee proposal the processing of individual loans is performed by college authorities rather than Federal employees.

Both from the standpoint of benefit to the students and costs to the Government, the committee proposal deserves your support.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is recognized.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 13247, which is submitted as a bill to strengthen the national defense, and for other purposes, is actually a part of the unending push for more and more power here in Washington for the Federal bureaucracy and less and less for the States and the people. And it also is part of the dangerous trend toward bigger and bigger Federal deficits.

This bill, if approved, would be the opening wedge to take the Federal Government into the entire system of education. It could very well lead to the destruction of our public educational concept as our Founding Fathers so wisely formulated it.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, by tempting people to depend on others for things they can do better for themselves, the program provided for by this bill, instead of stimulating educational activity, would doubtless tend in the long run to depress the efforts of the States and their political subdivisions and private interests for better educational opportunities.

The theories behind this bill—for example, that many gifted young people are not going to college simply because they lack the financial means—have never been substantiated. Surveys indicate, in fact, that about 250,000 scholarships are now available annually, without any Federal intervention in the educational system such as is contemplated by the bill before us, and that thousands of these scholarships are going unused each year.

It is unlikely that the Congress will be able to solve our educational problems by plunging the deficit-burdened Federal Treasury deeper into this field, going directly into the production of scientists, teachers and scholars by handing out more dollars for student loans, scholarships, training of teachers, and the like.

Legislation such as this, Mr. Chairman, would inevitably lead, after opening the door, to more and more central government interference with and control over the operations of the Nation's historically independent educational systems. The proposals in this bill are

neither desirable nor necessary, while loaded with danger.

We must not lose sight of the fact that respect for education must first be homegrown; it cannot be bought in Congress for our people. While improvement should certainly be sought at all times for both the quantity and quality of our education, the fact is that this is an accomplishment which can be made to the extent that local and State leaders, in public and private life, will it to be, but not more than that. The Congress cannot effectively legislate to bring this about.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] is recognized.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the Ayres amendment because I think it is a step in the right direction. First, it eliminates Federal aid and, next, it avoids Federal control.

Do not delude yourselves. The present bill is full of controls starting out with control by the Commissioner of Education. The Ayres amendment also eliminates the increased burden to the taxpayer.

But even with this amendment the bill does not make a complete approach to the problem. One of the better approaches would have been to have made some tax reduction for the people who are sending their youngsters to college.

I want to read a letter from the Governor of Indiana:

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis, July 22, 1958.

The Honorable RALPH W. GWINN,
United States House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: A hypothesis is only a hypothesis until it is proven or disproven by facts. Following the launching of Sputnik I, we in Indiana began a thorough, fact-finding study of our education system, particularly regarding science and mathematics courses, enrollments, and pupil aptitudes. The entire project was conducted by a representative committee of citizens and educators, headed by Dr. Clarence E. Manion, former dean of the University of Notre Dame Law School.

Every Indiana ninth-grade student received an identical test, the results being evaluated by a professional laboratory. We also gave an extensive test to high-school seniors to determine exceptional individuals. Then we inquired of these exceptional seniors as to how many wished to enter college, and how many would need financial and scholarship assistance.

The results of these tests and inquiries are detailed in the attached summary. Because there is now before the United States Congress proposed legislation for Federal scholarships, we feel that you might be particularly interested. We are convinced that Indiana does not need such Federal assistance, and that if similar factual inquiry were made in the other States the same conclusions would be tenable regarding them.

Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions, and institutions now independent or State-supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics.

Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually.

Sincerely,

HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
Governor of Indiana.

I am going to emphasize to you that it is vitally important today that we continue to think for ourselves and not try to imitate the Communist regime of regimentation and concentration of authority in the central Government. We must, as realists, take a strong stand to prevent being completely dominated by a powerful Government. I repeat an earlier statement that we must learn self-sufficiency and self-reliance and have a faith and belief in God instead of bowing meekly before an all-powerful Federal Government. Let us stop Federal aid to education now before it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, although I have some misgivings about some specifics of H. R. 13247, I am generally in agreement with its objectives and shall support it with certain amendments. Certainly, enactment of this measure will represent a significant step forward in the march toward full development of this Nation's intellectual resources. It is a step we cannot afford to ignore if we are to successfully meet the challenges of Soviet technological and scientific achievements.

The place of the educated man in our society is the subject of healthy and growing interest and concern. Original thought gave us our Constitution and many of the more material advances which have become the hallmarks of American progress. We perhaps have become too complacent in our superiority, too smug in our success, too wrapped up in our material wellbeing and achievement. By overestimating our own strengths, we have dangerously underestimated the potential of other peoples.

Much of the present concern over our educational state of health is, of course, the result of the launching of the sputniks. With sudden and startling impact the deficiencies of our educational system were brought into focus by those bolts across the blue.

For some time responsible leaders have been warning us that America's educational system is too soft. We have been told that we are making inadequate provision for the gifted student and that glorification of mediocrity has become a characteristic of American schools. We have been repeatedly cautioned about the great number of drop-outs among talented high-school and college students. We have been warned that the teaching of mathematics, science, and foreign languages is lagging in our system. And the increasing shortage of trained teachers should become more apparent each day.

Hand in hand with these developments, leaders have voiced their concern over the lack of incentives, of encouragement, and of prestige, for academic accomplishment in America. The use

and role of the egghead has more often been ridiculed than understood, more often been made the butt of jokes than recognized as an integral part of our future success as a nation.

What sputnik and muttnik have done for many is to place all these problems in a new perspective. They have shocked literally millions to the realization that something must be done to shore up our educational system and to bring it more in line with the needs of modern living and the challenges to our way of life.

Thus it is that worry about our educational structure has become not a nagging, somewhat annoying impression, but a case of deep concern for our national survival.

Sputnik and muttnik have pounded home the message that if the United States is to remain the most powerful nation in the world it must tap the vast potential reservoir of talented and developed minds, not only in the physical sciences, but in the social sciences as well. To maintain our ascendancy we must make full use of the enormous intellectual resources available within this Nation.

H. R. 13247 represents a broad-gaged answer to some of the more challenging problems posed today for American education. Many of its provisions go right to the root of deficiencies in our system.

It is true, of course, that the principal responsibility for education must rest with the States and local communities, and with the individual educational institutions. But, when we are faced with a challenge of such magnitude and of such importance to our national survival as this, the Federal Government can and should play a reasonable and constructive role. The Government can, in certain instances, come to the assistance of the States and localities and higher educational institutions as they attempt to meet certain critical national needs.

H. R. 13247 is an earnest, carefully conceived effort to help our educational system eliminate its soft spots and become better tuned to the needs of today. The central objective of this measure is to bolster particularly those aspects of our educational structure which are most important now to our national defense. That is a laudable and worthy objective, and because it does not lean too far in the direction of any one field or profession, I believe it has been adequately met in this measure.

I am in general accord with those provisions of this measure which seek to encourage an improvement and expansion in the teaching of mathematics, the sciences, and modern foreign languages. I applaud the efforts in this bill which seek to prepare more college teachers to train the scientists, teachers, and other leaders of tomorrow. The provision to increase the flow and accuracy and timeliness of educational statistics from the States should prove extremely helpful to the progress of education all over the country.

My principal interest in this measure, however, revolves around the provisions relating to grants and loans for worthy

college students. These provisions aim directly at the problem inherent in the waste of talent when students are forced to drop out of college because of lack of funds. These are the precious resources and talents we can ill afford to be without today.

There seems little question, based on copious statistics, that the lack of funds represents the most serious roadblock in the path of many qualified scholars who want to gain a higher education. The plain facts are that college costs are zooming and we are making ivy-covered walls barriers rather than gateways to better living and national progress.

The consensus of responsible surveys indicates that 200,000 of our best high-school students are not going on past graduation. Of these about half show no real interest in continuing their education. But every year we lose some 100,000 top-flight minds for no better reason than a lack of money. The college gates are barred by the dollar sign. This is an incredible waste. It is a waste we cannot afford in this day of all-out competition for the minds of men.

The grant and loan provisions of this measure are substantial steps toward the goal of assuring every American, who has the stuff but not the wherewithal, the opportunity to receive a higher education. It aims at giving everybody an equal chance.

Many educators have attested to the fact that the boy or girl who works his way through college, either partially or entirely, gets a good deal more out of his college experience than those whose families pay all the bills. But those who have to foot their own bills are often unduly burdened with the strains of that task and with the anxiety of coping with extra problems, with the result that the enthusiasm so necessary for a successful educational adventure is often blunted.

We can relieve that pressure by assuring such worthy but needy students—youths of demonstrated ability, ambition, and need—of loans and scholarships from the Federal Government. It will indeed be money well spent if we can establish a nationwide program to give full rein to the potential leaders of tomorrow in their necessary training, not just in the scientific fields, but in all areas of endeavor where their desire and capacities lead them. The good to the country from the use of such brains would repay many times over the expenditure for the scholarship program. And, of course, the Treasury would eventually get its money back from the loan aspect of this measure.

I do feel, however, that we should not rush headlong into this field. Historic as this step is, we should not take it blindly. We should not provide too much too fast, unless the necessity of the moves is clearly shown. That is why I support the limitation of scholarships to a smaller figure than that originally recommended by the committee.

Also, I vigorously support the amendment which will insure that only really needy pupils receive Government aid for their continuing education. This will not only cut down the cost of this

program, but will make sure that public funds are used to aid only those who really need the money for their further schooling.

My own belief is that the loan provision of this measure is the one most likely to yield sound results. Although I support the scholarship provision, I do feel, in the long run—from both the fiscal and moral point of view—the loan approach is far superior.

On March 10 of this year I introduced H. R. 11261, which would establish a self-liquidating scholarship loan fund in the Federal Government to enable highly qualified high-school graduates in financial need to receive a college education. I was joined in this endeavor by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] who introduced an identical measure, and who has waged such a vigorous campaign in behalf of the loan principle. Although the specifics of these proposals are not embodied in H. R. 13247, I am delighted that their principle is mirrored here.

Obviously, the committee has devoted a good deal of study to the best means and manner of administering the loan program. It appears they have worked out a reasonable solution which insures that only worthy students will receive aid, that the principal administration will be on the State and local level, rather than in Washington, and that existing programs will not be prejudiced but rather encouraged.

There is no question in my mind about the soundness of some sort of a loan provision. Clearly, it must be reasonable and workable, such as this measure. And it must embody a system broad enough to catch not only prospective scientists, engineers, and mathematicians, but students for all fields. These prerequisites are met in this bill.

My strong belief in the soundness of a loan program is founded on several bases:

First. The loan teaches the young man or woman responsibility. At the same time his mind is being trained, his or her character is being strengthened. I am reminded of an old Chinese proverb. Give a boy and a pig all they want and you will end up with a good pig and a bad boy. Education that comes too easy is not usually as productive as one the student earns himself. In fact, it has been said the root of our difficulties in education lies in the current penchant for making things easy.

Second. Our need lies in training fine minds. The obvious advantage of a loan program lies in the fact that those who apply for benefits under it will be dedicated students, students really desirous of obtaining an education, not simply of avoiding work or the Army for another 4 years. A loan program, by its very nature, is directed toward the serious student, the student who is willing to make sacrifices in the expectation of future returns.

Third. A program of loans can be fiscally sound. Soundly administered, it should involve no loss to the Federal Government, for in the long run these funds will be repaid. The records of testimony before the committee clearly

indicate the integrity of these young men and women and the high percentage of repayment they have maintained over the years. Many private groups, such as the Strong Foundation, can attest to this high measure of student integrity. Of course, beyond this is the fact that obtaining a college education usually means a higher income for the graduate with a resultant higher tax return to the Government. Any way you look at it, we just cannot lose.

Fourth. A loan program will not have an appreciable effect on existing systems of aid. Rather, this loan program is explicitly designed to supplement, not to supplant, existing aid systems.

I do not claim this is a whole answer to our present crisis in education. It is obvious we need more and better teachers, more and better schools, and perhaps most of all we need more and better informed interest in the education our children are receiving. We have no more right to complain about poor schools when we show no interest in them than the man who complains about "politics" and bad Government policies who doesn't vote. These are things that must lie with the people in their local communities. They are dependent upon what Dr. Teller calls a "climate of opinion" responsive to these needs.

I do believe, however, that there is an area where the Federal Government can act appropriately. By making funds available on a loan basis we will be removing the obstacles facing so many of our brightest young men and women in their quest for knowledge while at the same time leaving undisturbed the worthwhile efforts now being undertaken by private agencies. I believe the loan program, in concert with a limited number of Federal scholarships, will go a long way toward opening to our needy but highly qualified young men and women those gates now barred by empty pocketbooks.

Mr. Chairman, we stand on the threshold of history. Enactment of a soundly conceived program of educational stimulation, and aid and encouragement to capable but needy students would mark a substantial step toward the goal of an insured education for every qualified American. If we ignore our responsibilities to see that all worthy young people are given an opportunity to develop their mental capacities to the fullest, we may be threatening the existence of our way of life.

There is no more important weapon in the arsenal of democracy than the spirit of freedom. There is no more important stimulus to this spirit than education. Mediocrity in education is one sure way to crumble a democracy. Like a termite or cancer, it eats away at the very vitals of our way of life.

Mr. Chairman, with the addition of a few amendments, this bill deserves the overwhelming support of this body. At the same time, I believe the members and staff of the committee, who have labored long and diligently on this measure, deserve high commendation. Their work, given our stamp of approval today, will do much to improve the edu-

cational structure of our Nation and make us better able to withstand the challenges which lie ahead.

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] is recognized.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted this time merely to finish the statement I did not have a chance to complete earlier today.

Let me state in conclusion that I think one of the most important things we have to worry about is the fact that in scuttling the endowment scholarships we now open the door to a vastly increased program of this nature in the future. I think in all reality that when we peel away the sugar coating of good intention, we will find that this bill is nothing more than buckshot legislation aimed at a series of unknown targets. The best that can be said for it is that it has a hope and a prayer stamped on the shell.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is recognized.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, the issue has been raised that there would not be money available through the lending institutions at 4¾ percent. I believe the gentleman from Michigan said it would take a much higher interest rate. The corporations and the banks are willing and able to go on with this program. At the present time we are in one of the greatest housing programs that we have experienced in the last 3 years. Money is available at 4¾ percent. I would not want anyone to feel that the interest rate would have to be any higher. The money will be available.

I feel very deeply we will be making a mistake if we do not pass a bill in this House that will make it possible for our high-school graduates to borrow money and go to college, for there are thousands of them who are not in a financial position to do so now.

Insofar as title 2 is concerned with the \$10 million, if the amendment is passed and the bill goes to conference I am certain that in conference we can work out an arrangement that will be satisfactory to the majority of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] to close debate.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, may I say that what we do here this afternoon, and specifically on this substitute bill, will constitute the answer of our country to the Russian threat and challenge posed to us today. I do not think the Ayres substitute constitutes a sufficient answer for America.

I hope the Committee will vote it down.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORANO. If the substitute is agreed to, does the Committee then rise?

The CHAIRMAN. It would rise and report back, and then the vote would be taken.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry. Will we

then have an opportunity to have a separate vote on this substitute in the House?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MORANO. And if the substitute is defeated in the House, then what is the parliamentary situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The original bill will then be before the House.

Mr. MORANO. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AYRES) there were—ayes 68, noes 130.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer four amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. KEARNS:

Page 8, line 7, strike out "\$17,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,500,000."

Page 8, beginning with line 19, strike out everything down through line 4, page 10, and insert the following:

"SEC. 202. Each person awarded a national defense scholarship shall, for each academic year of the scholarship's duration, be paid the amount which the State commission determines is needed during that year by such person in order to permit him to attend an institution of higher education, except that no person shall receive an amount in excess of \$1,000 for any academic year under this title."

Page 10, line 15, strike out "Each State commission" and all that follows down through line 22, page 10, and insert the following: "Each State commission shall select persons to be awarded such scholarships in accordance with the requirements of section 206 (a) (3)."

Page 13, line 1, strike out "for the selection" and all that follows through line 20, page 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and for certification to the Commissioner of persons selected for National Defense Scholarships in accordance with the provisions of the State plan;

"(3) provides for the selection of individuals to receive National Defense Scholarships from among eligible applicants therefor, and for annual determination of the amount of such scholarships, in accordance with standards, procedures, and criteria, established by the State Commission, which the Commissioner finds provide reasonable assurance (A) that, except as provided pursuant to clauses (B) and (C), selection of individuals to receive national defense scholarships will be based on aptitude and ability, as determined in accordance with objective tests and other measures thereof, to pursue successfully at an institution of higher education a course of study leading to a bachelor's degree, (B) that special consideration will be given in the selection of such individuals to those with superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern foreign language, (C) (1) that only individuals who need financial assistance to continue their education at institutions of higher education will be selected for national defense scholarships, such need to be determined without regard to tuition, fees, and other expenses of attendance at the institution of higher education chosen by such person, (ii) that the amount of each national defense scholarship each year will be based on the individual's need for financial assistance to continue his

education at an institution of higher education, also determined without regard to such tuition, fees, and other expenses, and (iii) that the maximum amount payable for any academic year under the plan will be \$1,000; and provides for the annual certification to the Commissioner of each amount determined in accordance with the preceding provisions and the person to whom it is to be paid."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, these are the amendments which were discussed at some length in the general debate. They are the product of an agreement of 21 members of the committee and are as a result of the suggestion of the President in his letter to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]. We on this side accept these amendments.

Mr. KEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASKELL: Page 23, line 23, strike out "equal to one—" and all that follows through line 7, page 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "which the Commissioner determines to be adequate to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this section, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, but not to exceed a total of \$25,000,000."

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Delaware yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the Members on this side consider that the gentleman's amendment is well thought out and makes a fine addition to the bill. We accept his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have four perfecting amendments which I offer; and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ELLIOTT: Page 12, line 8, strike out "Commissioners" and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioner."

Page 33, line 1, insert "or" immediately after "shortterm."

Page 41, beginning with line 24, strike out the following: "For the fiscal year ending therefor to the Commissioner."

Page 21, strike out lines 13 through 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 908. The amounts reserved by the Commissioner under sections 205 (a), 402, and."

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, for our side, may I say that I have examined these technical amendments and we accept them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: Page 10, line 15, add to the Kearns amendment No. 3 the following: "without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex."

Page 19, line 1, after "student" insert the following: "without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex."

Page 36, line 25, after "Individuals" insert the following: "without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex."

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the gentleman's amendment to which we have just listened is the identical amendment offered to the Ayres substitute amendment, which was voted down.

May I also call attention to this important point, that was not made before, that the language of this amendment appears in 6 or 8 pieces of legislation that are in existence now, such as the school-lunch program, and, in my opinion, there is no unusual departure in the gentleman's amendment. It is acceptable to this side.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman has a most constructive type of amendment. I want to establish one point in everyone's mind so there is no question about it. The amendment proposed a year ago and prior to that, which was called the Powell amendment, denied funds to States which did not comply with the Supreme Court decision. This amendment is directed to funds which go to individuals, and merely states as a matter of declaration of policy that there shall be no discrimination in the application and granting of these funds. Am I correct?

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the philosophy underlying this excellent piece of legislation is that we are out to aid the individual. The school construction bill we had under consideration before was to aid the States. Therefore I have designed amendments to apply at the precise moment that an individual comes forward to seek a scholarship, to ask for a loan, or to look for a graduate

fellowship. At that moment the individual comes forward, then there shall not be any discrimination based upon race or color. That would include about 25 million of our American citizens, Mexican-Americans, Japanese-Americans, American Indians, Puerto Ricans, and Negroes.

There would not be any discrimination based upon religion, which would include mainly our Roman Catholic brethren and our Jewish brethren.

There would not be any discrimination based upon national origin, which would include those born abroad. Two of the outstanding contributors to our nuclear physics program today are in this category. One is of Italian birth and the other of German birth.

Lastly, there would be no discrimination based upon sex.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As the gentleman is well aware, my vote has been recorded several times for similar amendments the gentleman has offered. This being an election year, I should like to be permitted to join my colleagues in support of these amendments.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. As one who has opposed the amendments the gentleman has offered heretofore, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for submitting an amendment that carries out the policy of the Office of Education in line with a sound, basic policy of democracy and one that has been in existence since 1937 in this country. I believe this is a worthy addition to the bill.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Page 11, delete lines 22 through 25, inclusive.

Page 12, delete lines 1 through 5, inclusive.

Page 11, line 22, insert the following: "on the basis of their relative number of graduates from public or other nonprofit high schools as determined by the Commissioner for such year for each State on the basis of the number of graduates from such schools in such State for the most recent year for which satisfactory data for such State are available to him. For the purposes of this section a graduate is an individual who meets the qualifications set forth in subsection 205 (c) (3) (A)."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes. I have spoken to the chairman of our subcommittee, the very distinguished gentleman from Alabama, about the amendment. This is an amendment to title II relating to the method by which the allotment of appropriations for these scholarships would be made in the various States. At the present time, as provided in the bill, the allocation of schol-

arships in any State would be based on the number of 18- to 21-year-olds in that State in comparison to the number of 18- to 21-year-olds throughout the country. The purpose of the pending bill, Mr. Chairman, is to enable bright, young, high-school graduates to continue with their college education. Therefore, it seems to me rather illogical that we should pick an age group out of thin air and decide the number of youngsters between 18 and 21 years of age would be entitled to these scholarships. There is no more reason, in my opinion, to say 18 to 21 than to say 14 to 17 years or 19 to 22 years of age. This amendment simply changes the basis of allotment of scholarships in the several State from an arbitrary age bracket allocation to the basis of the number of high-school graduates.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would just like to point out that I have an amendment similar, in effect, at the Clerk's desk. I think the allocation of funds on the basis proposed by the gentleman would be beneficial because the recipients of these scholarships must be high-school graduates or have an equivalent education. Therefore, it seems logical to me and I find no disagreement with a provision allocating the funds on the basis of the number of high-school graduates in each State instead of on an age basis of 18 to 21 years of age, as proposed in the bill.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. CHURCH as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: On page 8, line 9, after the words "under this title" strike out "and who are selected for award of such scholarships by the State commissions" and insert: "and who are selected by the Commissioner on the basis of character, high-school record of academic capacity and promise of further development as determined by a nationwide competitive examination to be conducted by the Civil Service Commission."

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, the heart of this amendment lies in the last clause. I have taken a very definite position on Federal aid to education, to this effect, that local communities can best handle local needs for education as long as they can and as long as they will do it. I have stated in my district that there is no ground or justification for Federal aid to education until and unless—and I emphasize that "until and unless"—the local communities find themselves in an emergency or, through other reasons, unable to carry the burden. By the same token, I have always held that, if there is ever under those circumstances to be Federal aid, there should be a distribution of such Federal aid for and in accordance with need. For that reason I engaged in a colloquy yesterday with the chairman on that point, and I am delighted to know that in the distribution of the money for scholarships, an amendment will provide that the recipient must be in need.

But I still know that in the allocation of money to States for other purposes than scholarships in this bill, the distribution is still to be based on a school population formula. I regret that this is so.

I would like to improve the bill, if possible; and would point out that, in its present form, it fails largely in meeting the two purposes for which the scholarship plan was initiated.

In the first place, we were told that the United States now must have federally trained experts for defense purposes who could be developed from the highest in our student body, if Federal scholarships were provided to offer the necessary educational training.

In the second place, we were led to believe that a student who by merit deserved the right for further education would, as far as possible on a competitive basis, have an equal opportunity to go to college and develop his capacities. So, I question the wisdom of the proposed distribution of scholarship funds, by which amounts are to be awarded to State commissions, and by them awarded to students in their communities.

I am a former teacher. I have spent a large part of my life in educational interests. I feel very definitely that we are not by this bill finding or offering the best to our students; or that we are insuring that those who most need further training or could offer the most to the service of their country will receive it, if we divide the funds and the number between the States without consideration of true competitive ability on a national basis. We are denying a competitive basis; and because of the lack of a competitive basis, we are not offering a proper opportunity to a number of young people who have a right, on the basis of merit and capacity, to receive that portion of this money to which they are, by virtue of their capacity, competitively entitled.

Furthermore, I think that we are in danger of deceiving a great many students in this country. If we do not establish a sound standard of competition, there is no indication that many of these students will necessarily reach the proper college.

Originally, I planned to limit my amendment to a determination of the best scholarship candidates through nationwide competition, to be based on a civil service examination; but I realize that there are other considerations to be met; considerations of character; considerations of high-school records, and so forth, and I include those. But, I repeat, that the heart of my amendment is in calling for a selection of these students who we most need, who in turn by virtue of their capacity most merit and need the education. A scholarship, so awarded, would carry extra honor and distinction. Award on such basis, moreover, would tend fairly to produce those, who, after training, could meet the national need. It is not impossible to hold such competitive examinations. I would remind my colleagues that entrance to a large number of all colleges and universities is always by nationwide examination; nationwide examination, carried on by the National College

Board, whereby the school can readily see the competitive standing of the candidates for admission.

I hope that this amendment carries.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that it grieves me greatly to be on the opposite side of the fence from my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, a lady for whom I have the highest regard. I am sure her aims, her objectives are the same as mine, for we both are interested in that legislation which will best meet the needs of our country. But on this we differ on the method.

The gentlewoman from Illinois made the statement that there is no educational standard whatever set up in this bill. This is something the committee discussed for many many days, and the committee concluded that the educational standards should be set by the state agencies, for the awarding of these scholarships, based on ability and need.

The statement is also made that if we had it on a nationwide competitive basis we would get the very best students in this country. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if each one of the 48 States sets up its own method of awarding the scholarships we will get the very best young men and women in each one of the 48 States; and on that basis we will also get the cream of the crop, the best young people in the country.

In the committee there was considerable discussion as to how the scholarships should be allocated. One Member thought the scholarships should be awarded on the basis of one for each congressional district in the United States, or perhaps more than one if the funds would cover a greater number. Another Member thought the scholarships should be allocated on the basis of one for each county in the United States. Another member of the committee proposed that one scholarship be awarded to each high school in the United States. There are some 27,000 high schools.

After serious consideration of every proposal that had been made by the members of the committee and others interested in this legislation, the committee decided that the fairest way, the best way, would be to allow the State agencies to set up the method for granting the scholarships within a State.

In this crisis we have heard a great deal about Federal control. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we were to set up a nationwide civil service examination as the basis for the selection of the students who will receive the scholarships, then there is far more danger of Federal control than if we leave the selection of the scholars to each 1 of the 48 States. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to oppose the substitute amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, because sometimes in trying to make up my mind as to how I should vote it is necessary for me to think aloud, and because, although a member of the committee it has been possible to get but 5 minutes and have had some difficulty in getting recognition—probably because of my modesty—more time is needed to think about what is now in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that when our forefathers landed at Plymouth and down along the coast, one of the reasons for leaving the homeland was because of the discrimination to which they had been subjected. They did not have very much liberty in the homeland; they did not have an opportunity to be educated as did members of other classes and groups, so they came over here thinking they would have freedom and liberty. Not long ago we passed a civil rights bill which was presumed to do away with at least some discrimination, and we hope it will. However, it still seems, from what is in the newspapers, there is more or less discrimination. For example, in England, when the pilgrims left that island, if a boy's father was a shoemaker he became a shoemaker, and so on down through the list. Here now we have another kind of discrimination. In order to work one must be a member of a union.

This committee, composed of so many distinguished and well advised members, has been sitting on proposed labor legislation which would aid in doing away with discrimination, or at least part of it, in industry, for lo, lo, these many days.

Then, when finally a bill came over from the other body, the Speaker was sitting on it or, more properly, withholding it, for 41 days. And, to date, we have had no worthwhile legislation which would aid the union man in escaping extinction. What has that to do with the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois? Under this bill, as I get it, inevitably there is more or less discrimination. Why? Because the money is only to be made available to a certain group named by another group, State or national, I do not care which. It will result in discrimination. Just why should everybody work to give education to those who—by a State or Government agency, it is thought—have superior intellectual ability? Why not go down the line discriminating as to ability in other lines? Education is fine. But the first thing you have to do after you are born is eat. Later we train people to raise food that is more nutritious and of quality, and give or sell it to those in need. But the idea of making everybody pay for a special education for a few does not follow. Especially a group selected by specialists in education. Certain fields of education are specified. Experts in those fields will make the selection. Result—a group carefully selected to be trained for one activity—at the expense of all. I have noticed and greatly admire the Rhodes scholars and the graduates of

other universities and colleges; also those who have earned and have a long string of letters behind their names. I do. I admire you all, I will say to the gentleman from Maine, the distinguished, useful, alert, helpful Mr. HALE, Member of this body. But his education never cost our taxpayers a cent. Sure. You get the point? And, here in my pocket, is a long story. Look here. What is it? It is about the University of Michigan, a couple of State universities, putting in professors to teach what? Fishing. Fishing. The next thing will be what? A bill to appropriate money for more fish. And hunting. Now, I can see the middle-aged lady and the man out in the fields toiling away in our country, where they raise a lot of onions and carrots, down on their knees pulling weeds out, trying to get money to send their neighbor's boy to the university or State college while their own son or daughter, having little aptitude for book learning, is on his or her own. Education is all right if one can afford it, but we cannot go billions and billions of dollars in debt, farther and farther in all the time, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. LAIRD, earlier this week. What will we do? Pile up a greater burden on the backs of all the people to create a small group of intellectuals who will tell their intellectual inferiors how to live?

Years and years ago at mother's side she read, among others, these words:

Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin.

There is no thought that those who would benefit do not work—that the results of their midnight hours spent in research and experiment are wasted or not of supreme importance to all and to the Nation, but there is unfairness in this bill as now before the committee and, as now written, dangerous to our form of government as well. Our people cannot with safety be divided into classes at the expense of all. The most valuable education is that which is earned.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the committee carefully considered how these scholarships should be allocated. It was decided to do so on a State basis rather than have the Federal Government go into each and every community to allocate scholarships. Consequently, we on this side of the committee feel that the substitute amendment should be defeated.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Now, we have agreed that the only ones that can get this money are those in need.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Not for the loan section.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, now, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as I understand, pro-

vided that it was for superior scholars; is that so?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does the gentleman mean the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois?

Mrs. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield so that I can answer that question?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I will be glad to.

Mrs. CHURCH. If the gentleman is referring to my amendment, I was simply seeking that there be a nationwide competitive examination held by the Civil Service Commission which would take this completely out of politics or any other means or even out of any means of State selection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The point is whether you control it from the Federal Government level or let the States control it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. So we say this is for need and then we pass legislation saying that it is for superior students; is that right?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. No, that is not quite right.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Just one more question. On this Powell amendment it was stated that these scholarships were given directly to the boy or the girl. Then somebody else said that it was based on anything but that, that it goes to a commission in a State; and probably there are only 7 or 8 States that have such commissions; is not that right?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman that somewhere along the line we had to decide who would make the selection, whether the selection would be made by the Federal Government or by the States. The committee decided that it should be made by the States through State commissions rather than by the Federal Government. But the amendment of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] would put it back into the Federal Government.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would ask the gentleman from New York this question. Is it not true that under the present bill these students in each State would be chosen on the basis of objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability, just as they would under the substitute amendment? The only difference would be whether to put it on a nationwide competition or on competition within each State.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. That is quite right.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Do I understand that in the bill it is specified that each State shall give a competitive examination?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Yes; and it is specified that each State shall set up its own standards.

Mrs. CHURCH. So it would not mean necessarily the establishment of ability

according to aptitude tests or examinations?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. It is very difficult to conceive that a national scholarship would be used, as the gentlewoman has suggested, as a political weapon.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am not suggesting that it would be used as a political weapon. I would say to the gentleman that I am simply claiming that you may find some States less able in this case to present those who would compete with those of another State on the basis of ability.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to read the language of the bill to the gentlewoman. It says that each State commission shall "select persons to be awarded such scholarships in accordance with objective tests." Is that what the gentlewoman is referring to? They are examinations to be given by the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, permit me to ask a question of the committee. Is it correct to state that the money will be awarded to those who are in need? Do not all answer at once?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would be glad to answer, and the answer is "Yes."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it also true that those of superior ability as determined by some board are to get the money?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; it is.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am not so sure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The bill, as amended, provides—that is my understanding—that lack of funds, as well as special superior ability, must be shown before funds are available. The real question is this: How come that those of superior ability are in need? Will you tell me that? Does or has the superior ability caused the need? If so, why increase the group? It is difficult to understand why the more intelligent—those with exceptional brainpower—may I say—should be unable to take care of themselves.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question that I want to get straightened out?

This question of need has been bruited about so much, but in reading the bill I do not see the word used at any particular time, in any section starting with section 201.

Mr. NICHOLSON. When somebody asks a question, they go and grab the bill and read from it. The bill has been amended en bloc twice by 4 or 5 different kinds of amendments that are entirely different from what is in the bill. The question of need was one. Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania gets up and

has four amendments, and in them they are going to make somebody of superior ability qualify. If we are going to vote on a bill here we at least ought to know what is in it.

We have heard the story that this is for 3 years. Well, I have been in politics in my State and in this Federal Government for 35 years, and I have never seen one of these things start that did not grow and grow and grow. This is another example of it.

We are trying to legislate here on a matter that deeply concerns everybody in the United States, whether they go to school or whether they do not. We ought to go slowly and know exactly what we are doing. We certainly do not know here, because I think I can call legislation pretty good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. With his long and exceptionally brilliant service in his own State legislature he can call the turn as he has so often demonstrated in this body. If the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman mean we ought to be educated a little bit ourselves before we go along with a bill which will give us a small group of supposedly superior citizens, members of which are educated at the expense of all? An aristocracy of intellectuals?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for putting those words in my mouth.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, to those of my colleagues who think that by passing this bill they are settling a troublesome issue here today, something that is going to stay settled, I offer this prediction. You are merely starting something, not ending it. You are starting new, incessant and increasing demands—whetted by the taste of this initial victory—demands for more and more, in terms of new areas and types of Federal activity in this field, in terms of ever larger appropriations, in terms of further assumptions by Congress and the Federal bureaucracy of critical evaluations and decisions as to the content and methods of education, and in terms of direct Federal control of education.

By adopting this legislation you will give the greatest encouragement ever given by any Congress to that small but solid and utterly ruthless core of unblinking, unblushing, brazen advocates of definite, deliberate, all-out Federal control of education.

And I give yet another warning to those advocates of all-out massive Federal aid to education who think today that they have the smell of victory in their nostrils.

You will not have settled the matter either. There are still countless Americans to be reckoned with: Americans disillusioned by the sterile fruits of so much of progressive education and life adjustment philosophy who see no prospect of resolving America's educational problems merely by breaking open the coffers of the Federal Treasury to those whose sole or principal solution for educational

deficits is more money; Americans who are beginning to comprehend the folly of misnamed Federal aid financed by borrowed funds of a Federal Government which only day before yesterday again increased the mortgage on the resources and taxes of future generations; Americans who still resent and resist the efforts to supplant local and State responsibility and to destroy the moral and financial resources of private initiative and enterprise.

Vote as you will, my colleagues; but do not, I beg you, delude yourselves that this is the end of the matter. It is but the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to very briefly call to the attention of the Committee the fact that originally there was a title X in this bill which dealt with vocational training. Title X was removed from the bill by a majority vote of the committee. It was removed primarily for two reasons. One, it was felt by a majority of the committee that because the title actually was an amendment to the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946—the George-Barden Act—that this was not the proper place and that it should be separate legislation. It was also indicated that the White House felt that if this was included in the bill, it would seriously affect the prospects of being approved by the President. I would like, however, to point out to the Committee, in my humble opinion, and I think in the opinion of many others, that while we are producing scientists and while we are producing scholars, it is also necessary to build in other directions for the national defense. For those who are not in the field of higher education—those who are the supporters, you might say, of those who are going to be on the top giving the orders. Vocational training, I believe, is an important part. I hope a way will be found either through the Senate bill which, I believe, will include the title or through separate legislation to provide further additions to vocational training aids in this country.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify a question which arose during debate on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. On page

10 of the bill, section 204 (b) says that each State commission shall select persons to be awarded scholarships in accordance with objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability. So that, clearly this is contemplated in the legislation. With respect to the question of need by the recipients of the loans, the need must be established under the amendments which were accepted earlier. The entire loan availability is subject to the need of the individual student applicant.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from California as to the importance of vocational education. However, I would like to point out to refresh his memory the reason title X was stricken from the bill was not because the White House asked that it be stricken. It was because there were not sufficient hearings in the subcommittee and many people, including, I believe, the gentleman from California agreed that at this time this program should be stricken from the bill. This was nothing that had to do with politics or anything which had to do with the merits of vocational education. It was felt that there was not enough evidence before the committee and the subcommittee at that time to justify the inclusion of title X in this bill. I ask the gentleman from California if that is not correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to the gentleman that the subcommittee has since approved a separate bill which I introduced on this subject, which I think the gentleman knows.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that there were many people on his side of the committee who voted to strike title X out of the bill?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They certainly did, but I did not.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I merely want to underscore what the gentleman from California said about the necessity of strengthening and maintaining a vocational educational program. I want to join with him in his legislative efforts which he has undertaken to see that the program is advanced in that important field.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman sincerely.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would like to know what is the controlling factor. Is it need or is it ability, that determines whether a student is accepted under this bill?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say it was ability and need.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Very well. Then if somebody has the ability, he will not come under this bill unless he needs it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is right. Ability must come first, however.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then if you find a man who has ability, he will come under this bill if he needs the financial assistance?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And that will be a controlling factor in every State?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So you will control the States—

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. It is entirely done by the State, under the provisions of the bill, by State commissions.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It has to comply with those requirements?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It has to comply with those requirements, with the provisions we adopted under the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On pages 8 to 14, strike out all of title II and renumber subsequent titles accordingly.

On page 15, line 2, strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$47,500,000", and strike out line 3 and insert "\$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; \$82,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961; \$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962."

On page 6, line 12, strike out all of subsection (e) and renumber accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN. If I may have the attention of the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman on the Republican side in charge of the bill, I would like to ask a pertinent question.

These amendments, as I understand, bring this bill in harmony with the message of the President of the United States relative to this subject? It is in line with his desires.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. MARTIN. This is almost the bill that he recommends?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Let me put it this way: When the gentlemen on your side went to see the President a few days ago and took the bill and went over it, he registered two objections. The amendments which we have adopted this afternoon answer those objections. I think it is a fair statement, I will say to the gentleman, that the President makes no objection to this bill at the present time.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would go further and say that the President supports it.

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered would strike out all of title II, the title to which there is the greatest objection, especially by many of us who favor most of the rest of the bill. It is the title that as now amended by the committee, authorizes 4-year scholarships for 10,000 se-

lected students a year. For each such 10,000 there will be an estimated cost of \$7,500,000 a year. My amendment also would increase by exactly the same amount that would be stricken out in title II, the authorization for loans under title III.

The purpose of the amendment is not to make less money available for assisting worthy, qualified, and needy students. The purpose is to make it available to such students in the form of loans, rather than grants.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the real need that many, many students have. I had to work my way through 8 years of college and medical school. I have been eternally grateful that it was almost 40 years ago, because costs were less then and it was relatively easy to get jobs. I doubt that I could work my way through the same amount of schooling now. The same courses are so demanding that I could not get the time for outside jobs. And the jobs are filled by men with families to support.

Many excellent students simply must have financial assistance nowadays. The question is, Which is the best way to give them the direct assistance they need? I think the best way is to give it to college students in the form of loans instead of grants, or instead of part loans and part grants, for three reasons.

First, it is better for the Government and for the taxpayers, and for future students, because the Government will get the money back to be used over and over again. I cannot think of any better risks than these superior young individuals who are in need, and who will deeply appreciate loans that enable them to get an education they would otherwise be denied. They will welcome the opportunity to pay the loans back. The record of repayment of GI loans proves this conclusively, if anyone were to doubt it.

Second, it is better for the students now. All our experience with loans and grants, both in domestic and foreign-aid programs, demonstrates that persons get most benefit from help received on a loan basis rather than on a grant basis, whenever loans are feasible, as they certainly are in the case of these outstanding students. They study harder and with more purpose. They are making an investment in themselves with their own money. Because they are going to pay it back, they value it more highly, and the education it makes possible. It builds self-reliance and self-respect, and those qualities of character are certainly just as important for them and for their making important contributions to our national defense and general welfare as brilliance of mind or highly specialized training.

But, most important of all, Mr. Chairman, it is better for our society and for our country that we extend this aid through loans. It is in full accord with our American way of meeting our problems: We give loans, not grants, to farmers who need aid in getting telephones or electricity for their farms. We do not say to one farmer that he must get an REA loan and to another across the road that he can get for the

same purpose a grant from the Government. We would wreck the REA program, we would wreck the FHA program, we would wreck a half dozen other good programs if we were to do that.

Look what would certainly happen under this bill as it is now written. Two families live on the same street, the Smith family and the Jones family. They have the same expenses, the heads of the two families work in the same factory, they have the same income, they have the same need. Each has a fine boy or girl. They try for scholarships. They are of equal standing in high school, but one gets a little higher rating on some aptitude test, or he knows some one on the commission making the selections, and the Jones boy gets a scholarship grant. The Smith boy does not; he has to take a loan that must be repaid. What is going to happen in the minds of the Smith family members? They and he have to pay for the education of their boy, through repayment of his loan; and then help pay also, through their taxes, for the education of the Jones boy across the street who got a grant.

Is this the best way to do the job? Our country and our school system were founded on equal treatment for all, not on what is bound to seem to those who are denied grants a discrimination by their own government. If it is said that colleges or private individuals or foundations give scholarships to a selected few, that is a different situation. They use their own money and they can lay down their own rules. But these scholarships are to be given out of public funds to which those denied grants make as great contributions as those who receive grants. It will create resentment, not good will. The boy who has to make a loan, instead of being grateful for that loan, as he would otherwise be, will be resentful that he did not get a grant.

And what are we going to say or do when the Smiths come to us and say, "If we are going to help pay for the Jones boy's education, then they must help pay for our boy's education." There is only one answer: the Congress will have to expand the grant procedure to take care of everyone, and the loan procedure will wither away.

Mr. Chairman, it is not at all necessary to set up these scholarships. Any boy or girl good enough to merit a scholarship is good enough to be able to pay a loan back without difficulty or hardship in an 11-year period after his graduation.

Any boy or girl who is not sufficiently competent to be able to pay back such a loan, and to want to pay it back so that others can also get loans from the fund, is not good enough to deserve a free scholarship.

The scholarship title is not needed—and it is not desirable. Let us make higher education possible for qualified and needy youth by making the funds now authorized in title II available as loans under title III. That will do the same job in a way that will be best for the Government, best for the students, give the same opportunity to all, and will

strengthen, not weaken, our educational system and our country.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota simply because the entire heart of this bill is at stake.

I do not agree with all the features covered in the scholarship section, but I know it is the best that can be attained under the conditions, because the committee had a great deal of difficulty in getting to the point we have reached today.

I disagree with the gentleman who spoke so violently a while ago and said this was not the end but the beginning. The beginning started centuries ago when the first man scratched a line on the side of a cave. That is when human beings started the search for education. Throughout the entire history of the human mind each and every generation has sought to climb a little higher up the ladder of education, because therein lies the height of civilization. I think all of us ought to understand that in this very young country of ours we recognized in the latter part of the last century the need for some action on the part of the Congress of the United States to wipe out an error in our educational system and the Congress created the land grant colleges. Up until that time there was but one test for the person who wanted higher education, and that test was ability to pay. When the land grant colleges were established a second test was added: Ability to learn. So the land grant colleges were created and assistance was given toward educational tuition.

This Congress can advise itself and not be pushed by the so-called experts that have all of the power behind them as a lobby, but pushed by the needs of the time and the demands of the time.

We must achieve at this time the third phase, and that third phase must recognize the primary ability, the ability to learn.

The fourth phase will be faced by some other Congress at some future date when that Congress must come to the point, if it demands that higher education is essential in every field of endeavor, where it must make available for the citizens of this country that higher education.

How many of you realize that this body of men represents the only major field of endeavor in this country today that does not have the prerequisite re-

quirement of higher education in order to attain success? We are the last of the arts that are now practiced in this country, and we can do so from any level from whence we start without any regard to our past educational abilities or requirements that are demanding as they are today; 80 to 85 percent of the citizens of this country cannot participate in Government because your civil service requirements are so stringent, their demands for a higher education as a prerequisite so severe, they thereby close the door to thousands upon thousands of Americans who could and probably would be good civil servants. But, there are no opportunities, because educational requirement is a very important thing. I say to you in the scholarship section of the bill I would, if I could, have designated the study that had to be taken, because I think that the only real success for the Federal Government to get into the field of scholarships must be based upon the needs of the people at that time and of the country at that time. Today it is scientists and mathematicians and linguists, but tomorrow it may be tradesmen, and then you would have your occupational schools come into the picture. It may be medical scientists that we need tomorrow, and each and every Congress ought to determine the need, the number needed and the amount of money required for that particular need at the moment. The chairman himself tried hard to get a specification of the studies. He could not get it and took the next best that he could. I say to you if this program continues, it is entirely conceivable and possible that out of the entire 10,000 scholarships not 1 person would have to take a scientific course.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama, CARL ELLIOTT, on the splendid job he and his colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee have done on the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It is thoughtful, well-constructed legislation, conceived in the best and highest interest of our country. It represents hard work, clear thinking, and a high regard for factual analysis.

This bill provides for practical action by the National Government to strengthen education at a time when our country is no stronger than our system of education. It will provide much-needed help for teachers, students, school administrators, parents, and our colleges and universities. The cost is not a large one in terms of what we have come to consider as large Federal expenditures. It is a mere drop in the bucket compared with the expenditures for education of State and local governments and of private individuals and organizations, but it is a carefully aimed drop and its returns to the Nation should be very great indeed.

While there are plenty of statistics available, we do not need them to understand the fact that a great many of our girls and boys with great potential ability never have the chance to develop it. No person can really tell how many potential engineers, scientists, linguists,

educators, doctors, lawyers, and great spiritual leaders are lost to us because—someplace along the line—they did not have a decent chance to obtain a decent education. This is a loss we cannot afford, and we should be ashamed that it occurs in a country as rich as ours. This loss is not due to the failure of these individuals. It is our country which has failed. Every one of us, from personal experience, knows of bright and willing men and women who are handicapped throughout life because they never had a real chance to educate themselves. It is a myth that ability will always come out and that able people will always triumph against great odds. Some are fortunate and do triumph. Many are less fortunate in their opportunities and circumstances.

This bill would provide some help in preventing this loss of abilities which, in each case, is both a tragic personal loss and an even more tragic loss to the Nation.

For instance, it would give substantial assistance to State educational agencies to improve the quality and increase the numbers of counseling and guidance personnel in our schools. Youngsters need trained people to properly advise them. By the time a youngster reaches high-school age, if he has not already been encouraged to make the best of his abilities it is often too late to do so. It is certainly too late to help a student if he gets well along into high school without proper advice and encouragement in his studies. Yet this is so often the case in the large majority of our schools all over the country. That is why a lot of youngsters of high ability leave school long before they finish high school.

Also, the bill would give assistance in improving testing procedures. It simply is not true that the overworked classroom teacher can recognize able students at a glance. Many children come from homes without the advantages of education and other refinements which encourage them and help them to do well in school. Educators rightly feel that a lot of youngsters of high potential ability are never even identified. Such a child is very apt to be extremely unhappy in school and quit at the first opportunity. This bill would help to prevent this from happening.

Scholarships, about which we have heard so much, would go hand in hand with improved testing, counseling, and guidance in the schools. It does little good to identify an able child, encourage him to study the hardest courses, and prepare him for college when you know—and the child himself knows—that he cannot possibly afford to go to even a local State college. We hear a lot about the huge amount of scholarship aid available. There is a lot—but not so much as we think in proportion to the need for it. A lot of it is in mighty small doses. It does not help any to offer a poor kid \$100 when he needs \$1,200 or more a year to go to college and does not have the first dollar of it.

I will say this: scholarships are in such short supply that colleges and universities in this country each year take about \$50 million out of their operating funds to give as scholarships. This

means that they subtract that amount from such other needs as faculty salaries at a time when they have a tough time offering a good man enough to allow him to teach in college.

And many scholarships go to students in the upper 3 or 5 percent of academic ability. We need scholarships for able—even brilliant—students who do not rank quite that high. Just think a minute, we could not possibly supply our needs for good professional men from the upper 5 percent of our able students. When you have an emergency in the family and are desperately trying to get a doctor, you do not ask the one you finally reach whether he graduated from high school in the top 5 percent of his class. Yet our limited scholarship funds have to go to the highest ranked first.

This bill would accomplish a lot of other very fine things for education. In my State, for instance, we are extremely proud of the wonderful new school buildings we have been able to build in the last few years. They were desperately needed, and many more still are. But often, there was not money enough to equip our science laboratories in those schools with enough modern equipment and teaching devices. This bill would make funds available for that very purpose. It would also help us to buy modern electronic equipment to properly and effectively teach foreign languages.

The bill would help our universities expand their graduate programs to produce the fully qualified college teachers so desperately needed. It would help the colleges provide loans for deserving students so that they could continue their education and pay back the money later. This too, is a badly needed and most important undertaking.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important bills to come before the Congress in years. It would be a national tragedy if we did not take this opportunity to strengthen the defenses of our country in this fashion. I support this legislation with enthusiasm.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, by unanimous consent, yielded the time allotted him to Mr. SCHWENGEL.)

(Mr. BECKER, by unanimous consent, yielded the time allotted him to Mr. SCHWENGEL.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, first I want to make it crystal clear that I am in unanimous and in enthusi-

astic support of this amendment. I would like to say that I think it is a sad state of affairs when we, the Members of Congress of the United States, are limiting time on the discussion of education. Reflect a little on the great history of our country and note, if you please, whether there would have been a United States of America without the public school system. Now we are limiting debate, we are limiting a discussion of this problem that deals with the future of this Nation. I think it is a shame, and I resent this kind of move on the part of certain leaders on this floor who are limiting time and who, in my opinion, ought to know better.

Very briefly—I am sorry I do not have the time, because I think I have a story to tell that you ought to hear—my story is this. I have read the reports and I have noted the people who have come before the committee. Who were they? Everybody except the people you are talking about. I could find only one student who testified before the committee, a 17-year-old high school student. It so happens that I know something about the thinking of these students at the University of Iowa and in the colleges of Iowa because in the last 4 years I have had 40 of the finest students in the colleges of Iowa in my home, for a week. We talked about a great many things. One of the reasons that I had them at my home is because I share a concern for the future of our country, because so many of our people do not seem to care about our Government, the greatest system and way of life ever given to man. They just do not seem to care. Check the records of your school board elections. Check the records of your city elections. Check the records of your own elections, and see how many people in your own districts do not really care. And now we are limiting time for debate, to discuss what to do about this matter. You have a bill here that is going to do something about science, mathematics and the languages.

I have heard some people say something about Russia. I have had some experience with the Russians. A year ago some of them came into my district. They were invited there by our people to observe what happens in a farm community. While they were there they were shown our schools. I was there one day at a luncheon and sat right beside this man from Russia. I said to him, "What do you think about these things?" and specifically because of my interest in schools I asked him, "What do you think of our school system?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I read the bill, the report, and part of the hearing. I thought I knew what this was all about, but since we have had so many amendments I would like to ask 1 or 2 questions of the sponsor of this amendment and of the chairman handling the bill.

As I understand it, so far as scholarships are concerned, there is an ability

and a needs test. With respect to loans, can the gentleman tell me whether a college student has to be in need to qualify for a loan?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. On page 19 of the bill it says:

(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study and has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution

And so forth.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Is that the understanding of the committee?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Who determines that qualification, the Federal Government or the State government?

Mr. SANTANGELO. The State government, I understand, sets forth the requirements for need.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER].

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the Elliott bill is a good bill, but I think it would be a better bill if the loan principle suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota were adopted. An education for a boy or a girl is a capital investment, and he or she should be willing to pay back this money. The money could then be used for someone else.

May I ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee, the able and hard-working gentleman from Alabama? On page 38, with respect to the limitations on fellowships, there is a limitation concerning not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment. I should like to have the gentleman make it clear that this is not restricted to merely teaching and research but could include menial work such as waiting on tables or other things that students frequently do to help pay their expenses.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The jobs the gentleman mentions are not excluded.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCHWENGEL moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I know there may be those who resent this move, but I feel this so deeply that I cannot help myself, and I am using this method to call some matters to your attention that I think are of grave importance.

Before I sat down a while ago I was telling about this Russian who visited in Washington, Iowa, and with whom I

had lunch. I had just gotten through asking him a question of what he thought about our school system. He said, "I visited your school this morning," and we have a fine public school at Washington, Iowa. He said, "You have wonderful buildings and you have nice teachers but you have too many decisions granted to the students. They can make up their own minds as to what they want. In Russia we tell them what they want."

This is the difference. And what a difference. What was he saying? "Here in America you have too much freedom. That is what is the matter with America."

Some of you are worried. Yes, I am worried about Russia, too. I am worried most of all for the people of Russia because they do not have the advantage and opportunity the boys and girls of America have. I say to you, it is high time we quit talking about the educational system over there and its competition with us, because all in the world their educational system is doing is leading that nation and their people to a great downfall some day, there is a difference. We teach a moral philosophy, we teach a concern for our fellow men, and they teach a concern for their state.

So I am not too concerned about that Russian philosophy ever taking over so long as we protect our basic freedoms and all of America share their responsibilities as participating citizens. I do not think there is a Member of this House who if he had a chance to take the top scientists out of the University of Moscow or the average boy with average training from Parsons College, a college of around 800 students, or Drake or Notre Dame or any other college in the United States, you would not have him. Why? Because they just would not be educated on the basic philosophies we call the American way of life.

They might be great scientists all right, but they would not be contributing to our way of life.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. If there is anything wrong with our educational system, why have we become the greatest Nation in all the world, the greatest leader in industrial and agricultural productivity through our American way of life? If there was anything wrong with our education system, how did America grow to such great strength and attain the position of leadership that we have throughout the world. Certainly, I cannot see anything wrong with our educational system.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is the gentleman in agreement with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I certainly am. I thought I made that crystal clear when I started to speak.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I wish every Member of this House would listen to me. In addition, to the 40 students who visit my home from the colleges of Iowa for a week, I have a student program which I call my research team—graduate students or senior students at the University of Iowa. In the last 4 years, I have had 8 different ones. They have been on my payroll. There is an idea for some or each of you who are so concerned about the student problem, and I am sure you are to do something. Why do you not get some of them on your payroll? Give them a job to do, under the direction of some of these very able faculty members of the colleges you represent. You will be amazed at some of the contributions they can make. Three years ago I had these students study this question of need of higher education and this question of what the Federal Government can do about it. We sent them every bill introduced in the Congress of the United States and all the reports and all the information that we could get. Asked them make a thorough study of these bills. I am going to tell you something. I want to assure you that the Government of the United States got its money's worth for the time and work and effort that these students put into that project. After they had studied the problem and after they did research at the grassroots and after they had talked with virtually hundreds of students at the University of Iowa, this graduate student group came up with some recommendations. And do you know there was not one recommendation for a scholarship plan similar to the one that is being presented to us here today? Here is their recommendation. I want to read this to you. The complete statement I am referring to is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 11, last year, at page A7438. You will see there the excellent report that these students from the University of Iowa made.

Mr. Chairman, the statement is as follows:

INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR PARENTS OF
COLLEGE STUDENTS

(Extension of remarks of Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, in the House of Representatives, Friday, August 30, 1957)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, near the close of this session of the 85th Congress, I introduced H. R. 9414 to provide fair and equitable income tax deduction for the parents who bear the expense of sending students to college.

The introduction of this bill is based upon a thorough study of the costs of sending students to college and the incomes of the parents who pay these costs. A legislative research team at the State University of Iowa, composed of William O'Connell, Arthur Kudart, and Rodney Miller, conducted a survey and did other research for me which bears out the need for such legislation.

The findings of this group have been summarized in a report which should have the attention and study of all Members who have an interest in making it possible to maintain a high standard of college-trained citizens to direct the destiny of this Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD this report. The report follows:

"In the recent months discussion of the crisis in higher education has been heard all over America. Publications of all complexions and persuasions have carried stories outlining their views, analyses and solutions of the problems facing the Nation in this vital field.

"Regardless of the paper one reads it is universally recognized that America today and in the foreseeable future faces an acute shortage of persons qualified for the natural sciences, engineering, home economics, dentistry, medicine, nursing, school teaching, and college teaching.

"Many reasons are given for this shortage. One, however, appears on every list. This reason is simply that a great percentage of our qualified young people are not embarking on a program to earn a college degree. Impossible as this may seem when one views the crowded campuses across the Nation it still remains a fact that only 51 percent of the students in the upper two-fifths of high school senior classes enroll—not graduate, but enroll—in college.

"The reasons assigned for the failure of half the qualified high-school graduates not enrolling in college are many and varied. One reason is listed by nearly every observer. This reason is that the majority of those students who do not enter college are, in one way or another, held back by lack of funds to pay the cost of tuition, books, and living costs.

"While college costs may be minimized through frugal living and compensated for with part-time jobs there still faces the average college student a gap between income and expense which has traditionally been difficult to bridge. Conditions today aggravate this time-worn fact.

"College costs have followed the lead of other items in the cost-of-living index and have soared upward. Just how far these costs have risen is well illustrated by a statement of Robert W. Murphy, general counsel of Borg-Warner Corp., 'If one heeds the voice of experience, he should consult the father of a boy or girl in college. Multiply even \$1,500 by 4 years and \$6,000 by 4 children (or select any number from 1 to 12), and it is obvious that a sizable minimum is required. This amount must be set aside after taxes.'

"A study of costs of 1,000 students attending the State University of Iowa was made by a legislative research team sponsored by Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of the First District of Iowa. William O'Connell, Arthur Kudart, and Rodney Miller, all students at the university, conducted the study and compiled the results. It is to be remembered that the costs at a State institution are generally lower than at a private school. Congressman SCHWENGEL's study found that the average cost to keep a child in school for 1 year was between \$1,475 and \$1,500 per year. The study also showed that the average parent had more than one child in college. The study further revealed that the income of the student's parents varied from \$15,000 annually for doctors to \$4,100 for farmers. For parents in the top-income brackets college costs constitute a felt financial drain. For those in the lower brackets these costs were a definite burden.

"For many parents, already faced with the expenses of maintaining a family, the prospect of providing college expense money of several thousand dollars per child is anything but bright. Parents viewing this future are reluctant to counsel their children to contemplate college against these seemingly impossible odds.

"Thus it is evident why a considerable number of talented young people do not elect to continue their education beyond high school. Weighing the rosy employment prospects of the present time against the prospect of constituting a drain on his

family's financial resources, 1 out of 2 qualified high-school graduates makes the decision not to attend college.

"This decision affects the national interest in many ways. However, three effects stand out.

"First. The strength of our Nation in today's technical and scientific age is directly proportionate to the number and quality of persons trained by colleges and universities for work in these fields.

"While we are well aware of the importance of the scientist in the current arms and missile race, this importance is analogous to the visible position of an iceberg. The unseen problem is our urgent and continuing need to insure an adequate supply of teachers and researchers who will give us the scientists and science of the future. The crew-cut young physicist preparing the innards of the ICBM at Cape Canaveral traces his talent back to the unassuming mathematics instructors who guided his training in high school and college.

"Second. Protecting our democracy is important and is dependent upon an enlightened people to guide its course.

"While some may argue that plain horse-sense was sufficient to guide our forefathers it must be recognized that horse-sense today requires greater refinement. For citizens of our age to make intelligent decisions requires that more and more of them be trained to understand the interrelationships of modern innovations and worthwhile traditions. In short, today and tomorrow's citizen must sufficiently comprehend his world to be able to distinguish between modern innovation and irrational new paths.

"Third. The well-educated citizen is an economically productive citizen.

"The average high-school graduate earns nearly twice the annual income of his eighth grade trained contemporary; and the college trained man earns, on the average, twice what a high-school graduate makes. In the plain dollars and cents of our present income tax, it is an indisputable fact that persons with higher incomes pay a greater share of the cost of our Government.

"The ability of the college graduate to earn—and contribute—more suggests a means by which our National Government can encourage more able young people to go on the college. The means would not call for the appointment of a national commissioner, the creation of an additional bureau, or the hiring of a single employee. The solution would neither subsidize nor pamper prospective college students. It would offer an encouraging helping hand to those who wish to make the sacrifice to work for a higher education.

"This means would consist of amending the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the deduction of certain college expenses in the computation of adjusted gross income of the student or his parent.

"The plan would allow income-tax deductions for these essential items of college expense: tuition, books, and a reasonable allowance for the cost of living away from home.

"1. Tuition: This item with the added laboratory fees makes up from 15 to 35 percent of the average college student's expenses.

"2. Books: In highly specialized fields of study the limited area of circulation of texts makes this an important cost item.

"3. Living allowance: This item would cover only those necessities which result from a student maintaining a home away from home. Thus dormitory fees and the like could be compensated for with a blanket allowance. This allowance would be set at \$400, slightly over \$10 per week for the school year.

"In this fashion the Federal Government could demonstrate its intention to join with those parents and young people who are

facing the prospects of heavy college expenses. The dollar saving for each student does not appear large when viewed alone but when added to the college-strained budget of a student and his parents it is a major sum. This investment in our Nation's intellectual future can be likened to the Government's program of allowing income-tax deductions to farmers for expenditures made in the conservation of our soil resources.

"The expenses occasioned in obtaining a college education are as surely 'ordinary and necessary' in the production of the graduate's income as are the multitude of far-flung conventions which now qualify as legitimate income-tax deductions. This plan would involve the loss of revenue in the short run. In the long run this tax advantage would be repaid by the graduate through his higher taxes and his valuable services to the entire Nation. At the same time it would provide direct financial aid to the parent faced with the costs of education of one or more children beyond high school.

"That this problem is real and that the need for relief is great is best indicated by the answer on a questionnaire returned during Congressman SCHWENGEL's survey. When asked whether he favored a plan to provide this income-tax relief one parent replied, 'Yes. The plan would not help me. My last son graduates this year but I know how much help is needed.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we vote down this preferential motion and get on with the debate and vote on the Judd amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

(Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to relinquish his time to Mr. JENNINGS.)

Mr. JENNINGS. First, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the time allotted to him.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. As a matter of fact, I have prepared an amendment identical to the Judd amendment. We collaborated on this amendment, and I think it is a very good amendment. I want to make it perfectly clear that we are not deleting any money from this bill. Rather, we are transferring it from one source to another. We are transferring it from the scholarship provision to the loan provision. We are getting into a field that many Members on this floor have opposed; that of direct grants. In the field of foreign aid and in various other fields as well as education, direct grants for such purposes are usually opposed. We have heard the story—let us have aid rather than grants in such and such a case. That is what we have been advocating in the foreign-aid program. It is going to be difficult to stop this program of grants. During the 4-year period we will have an opportunity to observe this program, and if we find that

it is good—and we know now that we are going to have political pressure to extend the program—we will then have the money coming back in to the Treasury from these students who have been granted loans and taken advantage of the loan program, to extend the program if future Congresses desire. This scholarship program reaches the maximum of \$22,500,000, in 4 years.

We are providing in this amendment that the scholarship money be added to the loan program so in the year 1959 the loan fund will be increased to \$47,500,000; by 1960, \$75 million; in 1961, \$82,500,000; and \$90 million in 1962. If that money is coming back into the program, we will be in a position to extend the loan program. We will not have to stop the loan program if it has proven successful, which I prophesy it will.

I want to place emphasis on the fact that we are not taking anything away from this program, but we are merely changing the conception from a grant or scholarship program, which will give only a scholarship to 1 student in say every 3 to 5 high schools. It is going to be discrimination of the worst order if it is left the way it is in the bill. We will remove that discrimination if we pass the Judd amendment. We will remove the double standard of one or the same student applying under two sections and another student under another section.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman agree that any student who is good enough to qualify for a scholarship will certainly be good enough to be able to pay back a loan?

Mr. JENNINGS. Not only that, but he will want to pay it back, so others may participate also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. JUDD.] I introduced a bill on this subject which provided for a loan program. Such a loan program is used widely in many parts of the country making higher education available to those who could not otherwise attend college. We should eliminate title II as proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. I know that these students who obtain these loans will turn out to be better citizens. They will appreciate the education they pay for. They will be in a position at the conclusion of their college courses to earn enough money to pay back the loans. They will gladly do so. There will be no doubt about employment of these deserving graduates. These programs are working well in my State at this time—the program I have in mind is a loan foundation set up by the Luxora Rotary Club at Luxora, Ark. The plan has been adopted by the Osceola and Joiner Rotary Clubs as well. They have made these loans available to young

men and women in my State who could not have obtained an education without the loan. These programs are successful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. TEWES].

(Mr. TEWES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TEWES. It always strikes me as amusingly ironic when I am compelled to say in 1 minute what is in the hearts of the one-half million people I represent.

The House will remember that I proposed loans last year during the debates on the school-construction bill.

I think the principles which were applicable then are applicable now. First, argument has been made here that the cost for grants is too great for a country in financial distress. Loans will, while accomplishing our purpose, relieve this pressure. Second, the argument has been made that such grants will lead to Federal control of education. Again, loans make this possibility more remote. Third, the argument has been made that grants to students will create inequities, since all will pay taxes, but few will benefit directly. Loans remove such an objection. Finally, the argument has been made that Federal scholarships will pre-empt a field which is presently being occupied more and more by private corporations. Loans will not hinder this desirable and growing participation in education by private enterprise.

All in all, loans seem to me to be a workable solution to the problem of helping in education where we want to help without creating vast new problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, in the give and take of the committee debates and voting on this bill, we have hammered out a bill the objectives of which are worthy of the support of every Member of this body. The scholarship title is one of the most important provisions.

In that connection, a word of praise should be given to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] for his untiring efforts to get this bill before you. His leadership of the work of our subcommittee on this bill began well before the advent of sputnik. We did not need the arrival of manmade satellites to demonstrate the need for a greatly stepped-up Federal effort in the field of education.

But the purpose of this amendment would not be to step up the Federal effort in education—it is another attempt to cut down on the amount of Federal grants for schools.

If Russia spends more on missiles—our Defense Department and generals say we must spend more to survive.

If Russia spends more on satellites, our leaders say we must if we are to keep our place in the sun—and perhaps win a place on the moon.

If Russia is about to send economic aid to some country—we are told we must to compete for men's minds and hearts in this struggle between communism and democracy.

But if Russia spends more of her national income on education to train the future scientists, and engineers, and mathematicians, and linguists—we are told we do not need to spend more money on education to compete with the Russians or anyone else—and like the proverbial ostrich we hide our heads in the sand and pretend our schools are the best in the world. We ignore the deficiencies in our Nation's educational system—and hope that by pretending they are not there that they will go away.

We have debated this question of Federal aid almost every year. And every year we hear about the danger of "letting the camel's nose under the tent"—about the "dangers of Federal control"—about the need to economize—that the American people cannot afford this money for the schools. And yet the one thing that the launching of sputnik demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt was that education in the United States was lagging—that we had not, at the Federal level, devoted to it the leadership and the financial support which it deserves.

Since World War II—according to the Library of Congress—the United States and Russia have spent approximately \$700 billion on defense—on safety. And yet how much safety have we bought.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we could spend a fraction—a small fraction—of that amount on education, we might be more certain of keeping our place in the sun—in retaining our position as world leader.

As I said a moment ago, the debate over Federal aid for education is not new—far from it. The very first Congress passed an act establishing a system of copyrights—and how did they designate their action? The act of May 31, 1790, is entitled, "An act for the encouragement of learning."

The Members of the First Congress were not hesitant in proclaiming to the Nation that, as they envisioned the role of the Federal Government under the Constitution, it had a duty to encourage learning in the country. I call your attention to the fact that the Members of the First Congress could just as easily have adopted a much narrower view of the cited provision of the Constitution and could have conceived of the Federal role as that of mechanically protecting property rights in literary works.

Forty years later, in 1830, there was a bill for public land money to be used for education and internal improvements. On this issue, these are the eloquent words spoken in the House by Mr. Tristram Burges, a Congressman from Rhode Island and the great-great-uncle of the present distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. Congressman Burges had this to say 128 years ago:

Distribute to every State a fund for education and it will be divided and subdivided into streams, until it shall reach every town,

every village, every plantation, farm and family throughout the United States * * *. When this system shall have gone into full operation, and but one generation has been cultivated and grown up under its fertilizing nature, no demagogue will ever rise up in our country hardy and desperate enough to divert or obstruct the current of its progress.

Here there was no shirking from the idea of Federal responsibility in the field of education. It was, rather, recognition of the fact that the Federal Government should assert leadership in assisting the States in this field.

In 1833 when an education bill was before the Congress, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Henry Clay, had this to say about the Federal role in aid of education:

With regard to education and internal improvement, these are objects in which all parts of the Union are interested. Education and internal improvement in any part of the Union are objects which affect, more or less, the interests of all other parts of the Union.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that through this scholarship and loan bill, we will do much to raise the standards—the value of and the respect for academic achievement. Every State's education system will be affected by this congressional action. The scholarships given to the brightest young people in these 48 States will encourage all students to work a little harder. It will encourage school boards to offer the kind of an educational program which will make it possible for the students to compete successfully.

With the enactment of a bill designed to achieve the objectives of H. R. 13247 we shall not be embarking upon an uncharted and unknown course of action. We shall be but renewing the role assigned to the Federal Government by the very first Congress of the United States when it recognized the duty of the Congress to encourage learning. We shall be following the admonition of Congressman Burges over a century and a quarter ago when he advised this body that an educated people is a free people.

Freedom does not come cheap or easy. The diffusion of knowledge, of learning, and of education throughout the land is as much needed today as it was at the time of the founding of our Nation.

Let us hope that we have as much wisdom and foresight as did our predecessors in this body and recognize that the Federal Government has and must exercise a continuing leadership role in aid of education. Let us vote to strengthen the bill now under consideration. Let us vote down all crippling amendments—and the amendment to eliminate scholarships is just that.

And in the end let us vote for a strong bill, one that has been carefully worked out in the committee, a bill to provide Federal aid for education in recognition of the truths spoken in the other body by the then Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Henry Clay, that—Education and internal improvements are objects which affect the interests of all other parts of the Union. Yes, and of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.]

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, much as I admire the gentleman from Minnesota, I feel his amendment should be defeated. The approach of the committee was to present a balanced program. If we eliminate the scholarship provision altogether, we will certainly not create a balance.

The gentleman suggested we could improve the bill, and get more money if we had no scholarship title in the bill and simply emphasized the loan program. I was one of those who went to the White House recently to discuss this bill with President Eisenhower, who had not listed loans in his suggestions. I might say, following up what the minority leader just said, that the President definitely did not suggest the elimination of the scholarship program because we had added the loan provision. He did suggest that less scholarships be made available and that they be based on need.

The loan program and the scholarship programs tie in together and each fills a different need. The scholarship program is included as a method of providing an incentive to exceptionally qualified students who otherwise might not continue their education. Both programs fill a need and the scholarship program is based on a needs test.

I think it is important that we have a modest scholarship program such as is presently contained in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. WAINWRIGHT yielded his time to Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman mentioned the fact that this was a balanced bill. I wonder if we should not give a little consideration to a balanced budget?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, again, if we are talking about balancing the budget with \$7,500,000 by striking out the scholarship provision, I would say we had reached the height of absurdity. The whole program will cost something over \$200 million a year. Some proponents of the scholarship section said that a modest program would be totally inadequate. They suggested as many as 60,000 scholarships a year.

One gentleman who spoke said that the great difference between this country and the Soviet Union is that our people have more freedom. If that is the case then we want our young people to have more freedom in the field of education. They would be more free as recipients of scholarships than if they could only seek aid from a loan program.

We must be reasonable. We must recognize academic distinction. The more we encourage our young people to seek scholarships, which are both prizes and a recognition of need, the better off the whole country will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized.

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] a question. It is my understanding that in the 83d Congress the gentleman from Minnesota had passed in that Congress a provision for \$850,000 to provide money for scholarships to Chinese and Korean students. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman whether that was based on a direct grant or on repayment.

Mr. JUDD. Those students were given aid on the basis of grants because they were stranded here. There was no place they could go unless we sent them back to Communist China, and under the laws of our land they could not get jobs to earn money to support themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman feel that our students are just as worthy as the Chinese nationals?

Mr. JUDD. It is not a question of worth, it is a question of whether it is a good sound policy from the standpoint of the students, the well-being of our institutions, and the well-being of our country.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman means the well-being of not our institutions but that of the Chinese institutions. Now, the gentleman would, by his amendment, deny to American students that which he gave Chinese students. His objectives in 1954 were worthy, but his objectives today are shortsighted.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct myself to a particular part of the education proposal—H. R. 13247, as reported by the House committee—which has to do with the selection of recipients of scholarships. As section 204 of H. R. 13247 now reads, recipients of scholarships will be selected by State commissions "in accordance with objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability to pursue successfully a course of study leading to a bachelor's degree, giving special consideration to those with superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern foreign language." I believe that this provision calling for the giving of special consideration to those students with superior capacity or preparation in these three fields represents a negative approach to the whole idea of scholarship aid to students for higher education and, in my opinion, it weakens the purpose of the bill.

During this session of Congress throughout the very informative subcommittee hearings on the major educational proposals we have had the opportunity of listening to the testimony of outstanding educators, scientists, and leaders of groups with deep interests in American education. One of the basic thoughts expressed in the testimony of these people is the need for scholarship aid for the many students who have the aptitude to pursue higher education but who are unable to do so, because of financial reasons. It is these young peo-

ple that any education proposal must reach. We will not reach many of them if, in our scholarship provisions, we categorize and focus special attention merely on those with superior capacity or preparation in the sciences, mathematics, or modern foreign languages. As I understand the need in education today, it is for students who are willing to study and to prepare themselves to be the best possible scholars in a given field.

You may remember some of the points brought out about this very question during the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. Dr. Henry Chauncey, president of the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J., in his statement stressed the limits of categorical provisions in a scholarship proposal. Dr. Chauncey stated:

My personal conviction is that it would be undesirable to put into the bill a provision that a certain proportion had to go into science or that science had to be weighted in a certain way. Things will take care of themselves, and one can have the virtue of leaving this open and giving the student free choice of what he will do, and you will still get plenty of scientists.

Furthermore, we need these highly educated, trained people in the host of other fields. The danger is we will get too many scientists.

If you select able students you will tend to get a substantial proportion who are going into scientific work. This is just because able students of that age tend to like scientific work, generally speaking.

I agree most emphatically with Dr. Chauncey when he says:

I have no concern if we educate the cream of the crop of the youngsters coming along. We are going to get plenty of scientists and plenty of first-rate scientists, and we are going to need not only the scientists but the statesmen and, literally, people in all other fields. So I personally think that it is much better to leave the choice up to the individual. (Scholarship and Loan hearings, pt. 3, p. 1643.)

In my opinion, a Federal scholarship program should provide needed financial assistance and encouragement for capable students. Such scholarships certainly should not be used to purchase student interests. Dr. Dael Wolfe, executive officer, American Association for the Advancement of Science, expressed this thought when he said:

In offering a scholarship to a boy or girl who is about to graduate from high school, let us not try to purchase interests that have not developed naturally and that may not be permanent. The board of directors of the American Association for the Advancement of Science has discussed this problem in some detail and is firmly on record as recommending that scholarships be awarded on the basis of merit, without consideration of the proposed field of specialization. The Educational Advisory Board of the National Academy of Sciences, the Engineering Manpower Commission, and the Scientific Manpower Commission have adopted exactly the same position. (Scholarship and Loan hearings, pt. 3, p. 1859.)

Mr. Chairman, yet another important group has expressed feelings against the inclusion of categorical provisions in any Federal scholarship proposal. I refer to the American Council on Education

which approved a statement which said in part:

The student should have complete freedom to choose his own program of studies within the requirements set by the individual institution. Scholarships which are not restricted as to field of study are fairer to the individual because they permit him to develop his best abilities; they are better for the Nation because they insure a natural flow of qualified persons in all occupations. (Scholarship and Loan Hearings, pt. 3, p. 2035.)

I am thoroughly convinced that this scholarship bill should not give special consideration to students with superior capacity or preparation in only the sciences, mathematics, or modern foreign language fields. In providing the best possible legislation for scholarship aid, we should heed the suggestions of the numerous qualified educators and scientists who have advised against categorical scholarships. To be of real value to the country, this legislation must not provide for categorical scholarships. Rather, it should help meet the national need for technically and scientifically trained persons as well as the need for the development of capable leaders and outstanding scholars in all fields.

Mr. Chairman, I had fully intended to offer an amendment today, the effect of which would have been to eliminate the scholarship-preference clause. I realize, however, the supreme importance of adopting this legislation with as few amendments as possible. I am, therefore, going to abstain. The fact is, that the scholarship winners under this wonderful bill will be allowed to choose any course of study they desire in college. This fact, in a sense, tempers my opposition.

It is my sincere hope that the State commissions will not abuse the preference clause. If they do, the basic law can and should be amended. I shall observe carefully the operation of the law with this possibility in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] to close debate.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, we have brought to the House a well-thought-out and a well-balanced program that seeks to get at this reservoir of ability that is not today being used and developed in this country. We should have scholarships.

Let me call to the attention of my friends of the committee this: When you have something like the national merit system, which has been developed, which generates competition on the part of people to come in and apply to take the examination, you always have a great deal of interest. We need these scholarships so that these boys and girls who work hard and who study these hard courses in high school can raise their eyes with confidence to the star of hope—hope that if they get to be good enough and if they learn their lessons well enough, they might earn and win a scholarship. That is borne out by the fact that under the national merit system today we are getting 250,000 applicants who are ap-

plying in the Nation for 800 or 900 scholarships. In my judgment, these 10,000 scholarships will bring in applicants from well over a million of the brightest boys and girls of this country.

Mr. Chairman, the Judd amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 109, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That any person who provides more than 50 percent of a student's support while attending a college or institution of higher learning shall be entitled to an additional exemption on his or her income tax for any year beginning with 1958 of \$1,000."

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. It involves a tax question which falls within the jurisdiction of another committee of the House, the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order for 5 minutes?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I would like to be heard on the point of order.

For this committee to raise the question of jurisdiction at this time comes as a great surprise to me. Since when has the Department of Defense fallen within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Yet the title of this report is "National Defense Education Act of 1958."

Mr. Chairman, for the last 2 days now we have been hearing of what has happened to the moral fiber of America, and we have been told that the only thing that will save this country is to adopt this bill which has been so amended by the committee that it now has absolutely no semblance to the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not speaking to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania apparently is not speaking to the point of order.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I shall try to confine myself to the point of order. The point of order is that another committee has jurisdiction of tax matters. This bill includes appropriations. It has infringed upon the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee. It is very evident that the Committee on Ways and Means has not seen fit to solve this problem by a simple amendment to the income-tax law. It has seen fit to allow another committee to come in with an entirely new approach, an approach that is completely repugnant to the average American family that has been reared in the

belief that it is the responsibility of a family, and a local community to take care of the educational needs of its citizens.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is still not speaking to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOGARTY). The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment.

This is not an appropriation bill that we are considering today. It is strictly an authorization bill. The Chair feels that it does invade the jurisdiction of another committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. If this is not an appropriation bill and is just an authorization bill, when is the appropriation bill going to come in appropriating this money? I would like an answer to that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not in a position to answer that. This is an authorization bill only, and that is all that we are considering.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the Chair that the Chair has ruled that this is not an appropriation bill. I think my parliamentary inquiry is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee has already accepted an amendment that took the appropriation out of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SAYLOR moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, some time ago the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] said that it is about time we get the third step and that somebody make a motion to strike out the enacting clause and be serious about it. Certainly after the fiasco we have witnessed on this floor for the past 2 days it is about time somebody took seriously the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Yesterday, shortly after this debate started, I asked the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman who is handling this bill, after his statement that this program was to beef up our training of scientists, to point out anywhere in this bill anything that would require any student, who got any assistance under this bill, to take a course or courses that would lead to the strengthening of our national defense by their becoming a scientist or by becoming a physicist or by becoming an engineer. In fact, I asked him to point out where anything was required of a student who got either a grant or a loan.

He could not do it. The reason he cannot do it is very simple. It is not in the bill.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will not yield.

Today, the members of the committee began to discuss need as a criteria for a loan or grant. "Well, we are going to

require that all of these scholarships be given on the basis of need." When someone asked, "Point out anywhere in the bill where it says that scholarships will be based on need," lo and behold, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my good colleague [Mr. KEARNS], gets up and then says, "Here are four amendments en bloc that I ask you to vote on and adopt." This is the first time that a criteria of need appears anywhere in this bill.

If need is so important, if need is to be the criterion, because people who are in need do not have the financial ability to secure a higher education, why was not this important feature of the bill considered by the committee? There is no mention of it in this bill.

This committee has published 3 volumes of hearings, containing 2,096 pages of testimony, and then comes to the Members of the House and asks support for a proposition that has absolutely no uniform criteria for a qualifying student but will leave this to the individual State, and until amended on this floor today, there was no mention of need on behalf of any student.

It is very plain to see now that this bill should be sent back to the committee. It is so imperfect, a single amendment cannot cure it. They must be offered en bloc.

We now have another set of amendments offered by the gentleman who is handling the bill. He stands up and offers them en bloc.

The committee just adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] that completely changes the pattern of the entire bill. In effect, it deletes section 2 from the bill and takes all the money and places it in title 3 of the bill. If the testimony given at the hearings, and all the statements that have been heard in this well for the past 2 days are to be followed, the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] throws the entire bill out of balance. It is no longer a balanced program of grants and loans—there are no more grants for defense scholarships—they are all loans.

Many years ago the National Education Association devised a four-phase program leading to the Federal control of education. This act today is a step in that program.

About 1950 the House Committee on Education and Labor brought forward the first step—Federal aid to impacted school areas. I can still recall the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] pleading for that bill.

If you will read the RECORD of those hearings, you will find that it was a temporary measure also. In fact, it was a one-shot operation because we knew where all the impacted areas were and the total bill of expense. That program was to cost approximately \$150 million. Look what has happened:

In the intervening years, Congress has appropriated more than a billion and a half dollars for this program and during this session of Congress it was established as a permanent program.

The second step in the NEA program—building of schools—was defeated, but that did not stop those people who are determined to have Federal control of education. They have presented this program of scholarships under the guise of national defense. The bill contains absolutely no criteria whatsoever that has any connection with national defense. There is absolutely nothing in the bill that requires a student who qualifies to take any course that would assist in national defense. In fact, if a student qualifies under this bill he could, at some of our universities, take courses in water-color, ballet, and believe it or not, fishing. To further show how preposterous this bill is—instead of requiring a student to study a subject which might assist in the development of missiles, the harnessing of atomic energy, or the conquering of outer space, one might receive a loan and become an accredited fly-fisherman which I assure you will add nothing to the national defense of this country.

It seems that predictions are becoming increasingly popular, and although page 5 of the report states that in the fiscal year 1966 this program is to cost only \$5 million, I predict that in that year the figure will be a great deal closer to \$500 million, and there will be legislation introduced to make it permanent.

And then the fourth stage will be ready for the NEA. The requirement that the Federal Government contribute funds to pay the salaries of schoolteachers, purchase textbooks, pay supervisors' salaries, and even buy the custodial supplies. At that point, the need for the local school boards will have ceased to exist, and education will be under complete dictation of Washington.

It is interesting to note that during the past few days very little has been said about certain sections of the bill. For example, great stress has been placed upon section 102 of the bill stating that:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

But it is remarkable how quiet all Members are with regard to title 7 of the bill, which covers "guidance, counseling, testing, identification, and encouragement of able students." How naive does this committee think the average American citizen is? Because notwithstanding the high-sounding phrases of section 102, title 7 of the bill gives complete Federal control over students.

I am sure there is another matter contained in this bill which many Members have not bothered to read or concern themselves with. That is title 4 of the bill.

Since one of the avowed purposes of this bill is to prepare the Nation for national defense, and to encourage and assist needy students by strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, I know it will come as a complete surprise to many that it will be necessary that you attend the public

schools to gain any advantages of this act. In case there is any doubt in anyone's mind, carefully read title 4 of the bill.

In view of all of these facts, I urge serious consideration of my motion that the enacting clause be stricken and that this bill be referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I am sure the gentleman does not want to give any impression that all the grants have been taken out of this bill. There are a whole lot, including those for fellowships starting at \$2,000 a year under title VI, which add up to \$14 million in the first year and then go higher, including \$400 each for dependents.

Mr. SAYLOR. I did not say they all had been taken out. I said the grant provision in section 2 has been taken out. There are still some grants in it. But it has completely changed what the committee said was necessary, and that was a well-balanced program.

Because of my respect for the members of the House Education and Labor Committee, I will forbear my comments on the brainwashing possibilities of mechanical guidance as advocated in this bill, or its possible use by the members of the National Education Association in key positions who may be advocates of a planned society.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the preferential motion will be voted down. Most of the things to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania directed your attention have been taken out by the adoption of the Judd amendment. I was prepared to tell him the things in the scholarship part of the bill that would have encouraged and developed scientific education, but that title has been taken out. There are a good many things left in this bill: The loan provision, the grants to States for the strengthening of science and mathematics, that very good provision for improvement of graduate education—all of those are important measures of this very important bill, which is part of the President's program. We should vote down the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR), there were—ayes 84, noes 115.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, if we really want to do something for the youth of our country, we will vote against this bill.

If we want to represent the heart-throbs and the future of our children, we will give them a fighting chance to preserve a republican form of government, instead of miring them down with a welfare state or dictatorship. We will do what we can at this late hour to pre-

vent throwing them into spiritual, moral, and financial bankruptcy.

I believe our youth are more realistic than we are. If they are not, nothing can save them from the most horrible catastrophe that ever happened to the human race.

If we are engaged in a battle to outstrip Russia, and we are, we must understand that most of the fight is to be waged by those children—not you and I. Do you understand that? Whose were the bodies that fell in Korea? Old men like us, or beardless youth? Who are the ones we are training now?

Here is what this bill will do. If you started spending a thousand dollars a day the day Christ was born and spent the same amount daily, you could continue doing so until about the year 2200 with the money this bill will cost. Of course, the children will do the fighting and also the paying. Add this to the \$288 billion saddled on them and examine your hearts and answer to God—Do you think you have treated them right?

Talk about fighting. I am going to ask you a question you cannot answer, and no one else can answer. If we got into an all-out war, how would we finance it? Well, we ought to be able to answer it, but you cannot. Youth knows you cannot answer. Here is what Russia is giving its youth that we are denying ours: the spirit of sacrifice.

Tell your children that only to the brave and strong will liberty consort, for it knows the infidelity of the weakling and the coward. Tell them no nation ever dies that was fit to live. Tell them there is joy in sacrifice. Tell them the one who works the hardest and loves the most will win.

Tell them money alone cannot win; we are playing for higher stakes. Scholarships will not solve this. Scholarships are going begging now. Tell them it is a cruel lie that Russia can outwork or out-think them. That the death-dealing instruments Russia possesses now were stolen by rotten Americans and passed to the enemy, and that they must have a Supreme Court and leaders who deny that communism is just a political theory.

Give your children an incentive to resist. They will surprise you. They know this is not the answer. They know they must have a leadership dedicated to save them. You and I were selected to lead them. Where will you take the children today? As far as I am concerned, I am gladly taking the hand of that gallant Georgian, Hon. Phil Landrum, who serves on the Committee on Education and Labor, and all others from every section of this country who know that the tide is engulfing us because we refuse to teach our people sacrifice and devotion instead of spend, spend, spend—which forges the chains securely around the necks of those we love and are responsible for.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] covered the statement that I was going to make about the question of need and need being used on this floor for the last 2 days

time and time again. Yet it was never included in the bill that was reported by the committee, but had to be injected in an amendment on the floor. Yet we have heard so much about need as being the reason for this bill. Second—and I hope all Members will listen to me, because I want to strike a blow for the teachers of this Nation—I have resented time and again hearing about the low quality of our teachers in this country. I cannot speak for the teachers of the 48 States, but I certainly can talk for the teachers of the great State of New York. The quality of our teachers is an excellent quality. They are wonderful people. But you can only get from the teachers that which they are taught in the schools today. I am proud of our teachers. You can only get from these teachers today the programs that were engendered by the John Deweys, the Harold Rugges, the Professor Beards and the George Counts, who fostered progressive education. Please do not criticize the great teachers of our State. They are teaching what they are forced to teach under the curriculum handed down to them and by those others whom I have mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, no one here can criticize my attitude on aid to public schools or education, because I have a record of legislation in my own name in the State of New York carrying great sums of money to aid not only public schools, but also mandating teachers' salaries and mandating increments to teachers. I think what we do need here is a piece of legislation or any kind of legislation that would be clear and concise, and not legislation that comes out of a committee onto the floor and has so many amendments added to this legislation or detracting from it. No one can tell us exactly what this bill would do, and I defy any one of the membership on the floor to tell us exactly what this bill will do now.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an additional statement of mine in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN FRANK J. BECKER
IN SUPPORT OF AID TO EDUCATION

While a member of the New York State Assembly, I personally passed the first legislation to secure State funds to build the first quonset-type schools in Levittown, and thereafter until 1952 worked diligently with the boards of education to procure much needed State aid for the school districts of Nassau County.

In addition to the above, I was the coauthor of the Feinberg-Becker law passed in 1948 appropriating fifty-odd-million dollars for:

1. Fixing the minimum salary for teachers.
2. Mandating annual increments for teachers.
3. Providing \$200 additional for masters' degrees.
4. Providing additional increments on the basis of merit rating.

All of the necessary money for the above was carried out in this legislation.

I vigorously supported and helped enact into law the teachers' tenure legislation.

Since coming to Congress, I have fought vigorously for aid to school districts, particularly affected in Nassau County, that are known as federally impacted districts.

I appeared before the Committee on Education and Labor on various occasions to fight for this legislation and during the years Nassau County schools have benefited to the extent of over \$10 million. Such schools as Levittown, East Meadow, and Uniondale have benefited materially. All of these programs have helped hold down the tax rate in many districts.

For the past 2 years I have worked month in and month out to secure the federally owned property known as the Star Shell plant in Baldwin vitally necessary for the Baldwin School District. I have successfully concluded this proposition and the property is now at the disposal of the Baldwin School District, considerably aiding Baldwin in the promotion of its school plan.

Continuing my interest in education, the Lynbrook Republican Club this year honored me by establishing a \$500 a year college scholarship known as the Congressman FRANK J. BECKER Scholarship. This was in line with the President's request for private organizations to support the movement to help needy students secure a college education, particularly in the field of mathematics, engineering, and science, which is needed for the national defense.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. I join the gentleman in his statement relative to the high caliber of teachers in the great State of New York. I feel quite proud of the caliber of the teachers we have in the great State of Michigan. They are not second-rate teachers, but they are teachers of the highest caliber that anyone could expect to have to teach our future generations.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I want to leave the thought that our teachers in this country are great teachers. They have taught us and helped make us the greatest Nation in the world. Just give them what they are supposed to teach. Let them teach what we need in the interests of national defense and we will continue to be a great Nation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that title VI, providing for scholarships called fellowships provides a form of straight out, unadulterated, unmodified Federal control of education. Under section 102 Federal control of education is prohibited, but in title VI, beginning on page 36, the Federal Commissioner directs, supervises and controls this whole program of awarding of a thousand scholarships the first year, and 1,500 each year thereafter. The total amount beginning with \$14,500,000 the first year, comes to about \$85,000,000. Nothing in this title requires that these fellowships be confined

to science, mathematics, or language study.

I could support a bill to strengthen our defense by providing for these critical national needs. This bill, however, is for general Federal aid to education, with provision, in various places, for Federal controls. I am opposed to this kind of Federal aid to education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman what is the estimated cost of this proposed legislation?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The total cost is about \$600 million for 7 years.

Mr. GAVIN. You say it will take care of how many students, approximately?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The loan provision?

Mr. GAVIN. Loan or otherwise. How many? Twenty thousand?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No. I think it will run more nearly 60,000.

Mr. GAVIN. If I understood you correctly yesterday, you said you thought there would be about 2 million applicants.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That was my judgment, in speaking of the scholarships.

Mr. GAVIN. What are you going to do with the other 1,940,000? How are you going to take care of them? They certainly will feel they are entitled to consideration, just the same as the others.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have no way of taking care of them.

Mr. GAVIN. All right. I just wanted to know what would happen. It would appear rather discriminative legislation. Now under this proposed merit system you are going to hold competitive examinations. Suppose 2 million apply to take examinations under the merit system, and this legislation will take care of 60,000 out of 2 million applicants. I feel that we will have much explaining to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] is recognized.

(Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks immediately following Mr. GAVIN.)

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to call to the attention of the Committee that under the merit system perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the bright boys and girls of the country, those who are just naturally smart, will receive the benefit of these opportunities. Another boy who may be just as ambitious for an education as the one who has a very brilliant mind will have no chance. He cannot be considered, though deserving, and even though his need may be much greater, because he is not smart enough to qualify. So this is a discriminatory piece of legislation; it is not fair and equitable to all the youth of America, and I sincerely hope that it will be voted down. I expect to

vote against it, and I hope everybody else votes against it.

(Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose of education is to develop the minds of a people so they can govern themselves and thus be the masters of their own destiny instead of being a mere servant of an all-powerful government, controlled from the seat of a powerful paternal government. That was one of the compelling reasons why our Founding Fathers placed great emphasis on the individual and established our free private enterprise system. It was never their purpose that the Congress should establish such laws as would finally bring about a system here where any freeborn American would be beholden to a paternal government for their education.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a bad day for America if the day should ever come when our boys and girls can say to their mothers and fathers, we owe you little for our higher education, and I fear that day will come if this bill is made the law of the land. For then we will be educating our children to depend too much on a paternal government, and to expect and accept all sorts of Federal controls as is the case in every nation on earth where liberty is gone and where the individual is only a pawn in the hands of a Socialist, all-powerful government, because such an act as is here proposed by H. R. 13247 had been ruled the law of the land. We have already gone too far in that direction. Remember that age-old adage:

Just as you bend the little twig so will the tree be when it's big.

That admonition holds just as true today as when those words were first uttered.

Also let us not forget that, at this very minute we have a staggering Federal debt of over \$275 billion and just day before yesterday this House voted to increase the debt limit to \$285 billion—but not with my vote. Yet here we are considering a bill which will over a period of a few years add billions more which our children and their children will have to pay. Yes, most of the very same Americans that this bill seeks to help will have to pay the bill in burdensome taxes, if they can, or suffer the consequences. The true facts are, there is not a school district, or a county or a State in this Union which is not more able financially than the Federal Government to provide proper and adequate education, and education facilities for their children, and I am sure if most of the parents and their good thoughtful children knew that Federal control is written into every title of this bill they would say, kill it, as would their sons and daughters.

The first responsibility for the education of our children rests on the shoulders of the parents, next on the school district, next on the State, and only in impacted areas where Federal establishments have created a school expense too great for the taxpayers of a school district to support, there and only there should the Federal Government aid interfere or dictate.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, last January, when the President's state of the Union message was presented, I commented upon the section which resulted in this bill as follows:

When the Federal aid to school construction plan as defeated in the last two sessions was presented, both the Secretary and the proponents vowed that it was a get-in-and-get-out proposition with no controls and that they would never recommend a general aid to education plan. They must think the public has a 9-day memory. They are now recommending a general aid plan, with the Federal control of education that they know will follow. For 20 years of New Deal and Fair Deal administrations, we watched the technique being used of latching onto an emergency, to put through undesirable legislation. If emergencies did not happen frequently enough, they were created. I do not intend to permit those who would take control of our school systems at Federal level to use the sputnik emergency to accomplish their purposes. A sound Federal contribution, if any, must be in addition to, and not in lieu of, local effort. The integrity and local control of our school system must be preserved.

Mr. Chairman, that is still my position. In making that statement, I was not shutting the door to a review of any specific plans that might stem from the general recommendations. This bill does not stand the test of necessary legislation or of making a sound Federal contribution to the local effort. It is a foot-in-the-door proposition that will destroy local and individual initiative and lead to federalization of our entire school system.

It seems entirely appropriate to me that we should pause to ask what has happened to the emergency that was cited when the effort was being made in the last session to get the foot in the door at the elementary and high school level. The need either did not exist or has been satisfied by local effort. The dire catastrophe predicted by the proponents if that legislation did not pass simply has not occurred. Not even the proponents have had the temerity to push such a bill in this session.

Those people, though, who would take control of our school systems at the Federal level in all events have not given up, nor can we expect that they will. They have merely shifted their efforts to the college and university level, using the sputnik emergency to accomplish their purposes.

Mind you, I do not say that our school system and educational opportunities cannot be improved at all levels, from the kindergarten to graduate study. I think that it can be, but the primary responsibility for that and the control over it must remain at State and local level. And money alone is not the answer. Furthermore, I say without fear of contradiction that the evidence shows that the local and State governments are living up to their responsibility, both as to providing the funds and as to other improvements. Furthermore, if we are to meet the challenge of our time, we must regain, and not further detract from, our traditional individual American initiative and free-enterprise system.

Speaking at the Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation annual convention last fall, I stated that we have been turning into a fat cat nation and that Russia's launching of Sputniks I and II could be the best thing that ever happened to us, to jar the country out of its complacency. That will not come to pass, though, if we continue to rely upon the myth that every problem, individual or local, is to be solved by Federal deficit spending that threatens to lead us to national bankruptcy.

Members of the committee and others who have previously spoken have already established that this is not a national defense measure; that there is no general need for this legislation that is not or cannot be met without Federal intervention; and that enactment of the programs would be, in lieu of, and not in addition to, present individual, local, and private efforts. This has been done so well that I do not believe my enlarging upon it in the short time available to me is indicated.

Most of my colleagues come from more heavily populated States, which have several Congressmen. Figures are prepared on a statewide basis. For this reason, it would be natural in looking at these figures to get an exaggerated idea of what the results of this bill will be as far as a congressional district is concerned. Those results should be very carefully weighed by every Member against the \$1 billion plus that will be added to the national debt and the \$30 million annual recurring interest cost that will thereby confront us each year as we make appropriations.

Since the district which I represent is about an average congressional district in population and yet encompasses an entire State, with a complete college educational system, it seems to me that I might make a real contribution by pointing out just what this will mean to the average congressional district.

Let us first look at the scholarship program. It has been taken out by the Judd amendment but an effort will be made to put it back in by a record vote in the House or in conference. If that is not done, the proponents will be back later. This figure, as all the distribution figures which I shall use, are committee figures and taken from page 20 of the committee report. Under the scholarship section of the bill, there would be made available in this average district the sum of \$32,426. At the average level predicted by the committee of \$750 per student, this would mean a total of 43 scholarships for the entire State or average district. At the minimum level of \$500, there would be a total of 64 scholarships possible. But the committee says that it will accept the lowering of this from 23,000 total scholarships to 10,000. With this amendment, in Wyoming, an average-population congressional district, there would be provided a grand total of 19 scholarships on the basis of the average grant predicted by the committee, or four less than one scholarship per county. At the minimum level of the scholarship grant, there would be 28 scholarships, or 5 in excess of 1 per county. I am sorry that I do

not have the complete information to compare this with local and private scholarships already available. I do know that for as long as I can remember, a tuition scholarship has been given to the University, not to the highest ranking boy and the highest ranking girl in each county, but to the highest ranking boy and the highest ranking girl in each graduating class of every high school. I can tell you that the last session of the State legislature of this State, which is making the highest per capita expenditure for education from State and local sources of any State in the Nation, appropriated \$50,000 to provide scholarships of \$250 each to 200 high school graduates for study in the field of education. There are many additional scholarships granted within the State each year from private and other sources. The same State legislature which established the teacher scholarship fund notified Congress, through a memorial, of its opposition to any extension of Federal aid to schools.

On the student loan program, this average district is shown to receive \$64,181. The State university "already" has a student loan fund far in excess of this. But of real significance, is the fact that the State has over \$5 million unappropriated surplus in the State treasury. Besides that, there is many times that amount in both university and State permanent funds. Can we justify the Federal Government, confronted with a national debt of \$288 billion, borrowing to make such loans under these circumstances?

The grant to this State that comprises an average population congressional district for acquisition of equipment is \$127,268. This amount is not particularly significant when weighed against total funds made available to the University of Wyoming alone by the last legislature in excess of \$14 million for the biennium. In addition to the university, there are several junior colleges supported from local taxes. The amounts made available in this average population district by this legislation for improvement of supervision and guidance and counseling are infinitesimal as far as carrying on a program is concerned, being \$20,000 and \$29,262, respectively. There you see what this program means in an average congressional district.

Now, let us look at the other side of the coin. Earlier this week, we were called upon to vote a \$13 billion increase in the national debt ceiling. Somehow on this floor, for one of the few times this year, a Member could sense an atmosphere of hesitation, an atmosphere of self-recrimination, an atmosphere of responsibility. Responsibility, the fate of the Nation, seemed to weigh on most every Member, and well it should. It takes no mathematical genius to compute the sad state of this Nation's financial affairs. As we voted that \$13 billion increase, one could sense that in the minds of each of us was the cold, hard realism of sixth grade arithmetic that we were voting an increase in the annual appropriations required to pay interest on the debt by somewhat in the neigh-

borhood of an additional \$390 million. That \$390 million, appropriated year by year in the foreseeable future, would produce no better national defense, would provide no further improvements in a single congressional district, would add not one single dollar to the national stature. No; it was simply and solely a drain upon the future of America. What a sad moment that was for those of us, which probably includes the majority of the Members, that serve in this body at personal sacrifice because of some thought that we are contributing to a better America for our children or our posterity. All in one moment, we were brought face to face with the realism that no doctor of philosophy can escape, the simple truth and reality that we had created for all time, unless there is a serious return to realism, a drain of \$390 million on the resources and the production of this country. As this figure passed through my mind, I could not help but contemplate that here alone was sufficient revenue to make possible a public improvement program in an area conceded to be within the Federal sphere, beyond our fondest dreams. I could not help but reflect that this amount, going down the drain to no good public purpose, was sufficient to take care of the general appropriations in the State I represent for a period of over 20 years. To my mind again came the cold, hard realism that if we were to seriously contemplate paying off our national debt instead of adding to it with complete irresponsibility; if our people were ever to have a tax reduction; then we as Congressmen must line up to our responsibility. It would require an application on principal of that \$390 million for a period in excess of 750 years before we could eliminate our national debt.

It should have been apparent to every Member that the day of reckoning was at hand. Does our memory not encompass a period of 48 hours? Are we to so soon add another billion dollars to that incomprehensible, overwhelming debt that we have shouldered on our posterity? More than that, are we to, by appropriating for this program, add to our annual, fixed, inescapable national expenditures another \$30 million in interest payment, even if this foot-in-the-door program was to be accepted as the ultimate? This \$30 million is merely to service the debt. When will we, in responsibility, face the fact that all money which we appropriate is not free, but is money which we must collect, dollar by dollar; is money which we borrow to the credit of every individual American and which requires that at the minimum, we collect every year at least the annual interest charge? For this program to approach significance would require its expansion at least tenfold. There is a bottom of the bucket, there is a limit beyond which we dare not go, and we have come very close to reaching that limit when we are required to appropriate more money for interest on the national debt alone than for almost any other civil function.

This is only one of the reasons that a dollar spent for education at Federal

level is the equivalent of less than 70 cents by the time it reaches the local level. Totally ignored is the number of bureaucrats required to administer and supervise, if not jeopardize, the Federal program. When I weigh these cold, hard facts against what this bill will accomplish, if anything, there is but one answer. There is no need for this legislation. There is no support in America for this program. The needed adjustment will be satisfied at local level. I am 100 percent for education, and not 60 percent or 70 percent, as represented by what is left after bureaucracy and other Federal charges take their toll. I voted against the rule, because it was most apparent from analyzing the report that this program was not proeducation but was antieducation. I speak in opposition to the legislation for that very reason.

I am not negative. In the field of experimentation with television in education, there is a field of proper Federal activity. I have suggested to the committee that an expansion of present research through an expanded National Science Foundation program may very well deserve consideration. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has shown this has been done. I would even be willing to consider further expansion. If there is any defense scientific lag in America, immediate research is required to overcome it. Should that be the fact, we should make funds immediately available for that purpose. A major portion of these funds would naturally go to our colleges and universities as they are principal research centers. College students at all levels would be selected as assistants to accomplish that research. I have complete confidence that the professors and heads of the departments will select those students to work who are most in need and most deserving. We will have accomplished a dual objective of producing our research now and at the same time assisting these students, not by a Federal dole but in the traditional American way by giving them the opportunity to earn for themselves. In earning for themselves, they will be learning for America. If anything is indicated or required, certainly this is the approach that should be considered.

Mr. Chairman, there has been no need shown for this proposal; it is but a foot in the door; it will destroy far more than it creates as far as educational offerings and opportunities are concerned. If the Members of this House who are 100 percent for education will examine the facts, then I am confident that they will vote overwhelmingly to defeat this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] for 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MEADER yielded his time to Mr. GRIFFIN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: Page 7, line 14, after the period, add a new sentence as follows:

"For the purposes of title IV, the term 'secondary school' may include a junior college, as determined under State law."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, title 4 of this bill provides for grants in the amount of \$60 million a year, for 4 years, to be made to the States for science and laboratory equipment. The effect of my amendment would be to add junior colleges to the classification of schools which would be eligible to participate in this program.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of States where junior colleges have become an integral part of the State public secondary school system. Any need which exists in the high schools, so far as the shortage of science equipment, is concerned, exists also to the same or even a greater degree in the local junior colleges.

This amendment would recognize that in many States the local junior college, usually locally supported, is an important part of the public-school system.

This amendment would not increase the amount of money in the bill. It would provide only that the States authorities may in their discretion, devise a State plan, which includes junior colleges.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California who has been interested in this amendment and worked on it with me in the committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. I may state that it fits the situation in California exactly. I know there are other States to which it would apply. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman. My amendment will improve the bill, it will not add 1 penny to the cost of the bill. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, may I use my time in opposition to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 1 minute in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has done a distinctive service to the House in calling this matter to the attention of the Committee of the Whole. He is very conscientious in his efforts in behalf of the junior college program.

In title 4, however, the moneys available are only \$60 million, a relatively small amount considering the great number of elementary and secondary schools. In this provision for equipment aid to secondary schools we did not include the junior colleges. Were we to do so we should have an additional \$20 million to the amount carried in the bill, otherwise, we would be spreading the small amount of funds allowed in the bill too thin.

I oppose the amendment only for the reason that we would be spreading the amount too thin if we include junior colleges.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 110, noes 40.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, just after we have had to increase the debt limit \$10 billion because we have to meet our obligations and then to be asked to approve this \$1,700,000,000 bill makes me wish I had an hour instead of minutes to point out that here again we are doing the thing that has brought about our present serious situation. Apparently, we in the United States think that there is nothing we cannot cure by providing money. We have given too little attention to mathematics, science, and various other arts; but it has not been because those talented students who could do that work have not been able to go to college. The trouble lies behind that, in the accrediting associations, and in those who have set the pattern in our schools. And, if our present plan is to make available a source of funds to the American colleges—and that is what this is, and I have friends among them; they always need more money—but if we open up the Treasury for this purpose, in the name of defense, we postpone the day when they must bring about the correction which is needed, and that is that proper attention be given to these matters in the schools themselves.

In the military appropriations bills we are spending billions in the name of defense, but which is not real defense at all. I have enumerated many examples here in debates when those appropriations were up. Time does not permit me to repeat them here. However, looking at this bill, which from its title, "is to aid national defense," we note that it is to aid in the study of economics. That might be all right if they learned the subject, came to Congress and made us balance the budget. Next I note "history." That would be fine if they would study and learn the history of the Rise and Fall of the Holy Roman Empire, where they too "provided the money to enlist the aid of foreign legions" had hot baths for the Senators and perhaps for House Members as well.

But even before that, they should study the history of ancient Greece and Egypt. They might give close attention to Sparta—and the Spartan system. Even better, if we were to amend this bill, and provide scholarships for Members of Congress in such history—I would vote for the measure.

Now why they would, under the terms of this bill, aid the study of anthropology I don't know, unless it is to find out why many of these early people died before they should because they, too, refused to face up to the issue, tighten their belts and go to work.

I, too, would like to help my college presidents, the people in my district who pay so much taxes, who find it hard to

send their children to college, but I can't do it by increasing the taxes on everyone else when the Nation faces bankruptcy.

As one who did work when I went to college, I feel I am better off for it. You don't help anyone by giving them something for nothing. I wish someone, to whom they might listen, would tell that truth to Mr. Dulles, to the President and, yes, to the Congress as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, we have really disposed of only one title to this bill, and that is title 2. We have scarcely touched title 4 at all. That has to do with the selection of the Commissioner of Education; for graduate students, \$75 million. Here is another one for guidance, counseling, testing, evaluation, and encouragement of able students, \$84 million. More Federal control. The confusion is now such that the bill is unfinished in debate. It seems to me that the only thing we can do is to recommit it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], who is in charge of this bill made the statement a short time ago that the committee had brought a "well thought out bill" to the floor of the House. The Lord deliver us from any more "well thought out bills" if this is a sample, for this legislation has been amended until I am sure that less than a half dozen Members have any idea of what is in it now. A motion to strike the enacting clause is in order and I offer it now in good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask someone in charge of this bill—I do not care who it is—whether these talented students are to be exempt from the draft and whether any other provision is made in the bill for military service?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. What I am interested in, if a student took the examination and qualified, whether or not he would be subject to the draft or whether he would be exempt.

Mr. GROSS. Let us ask someone on the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The answer to the gentleman's question is "No," it does not exempt him from the draft.

Mr. GROSS. Then, how would you benefit some of these talented students?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Under existing law, as I understand, if a student subject to the draft maintains a high enough standard in college, whoever he or she may be, he is now exempt during the time he is maintaining those credits in his institution.

Mr. GROSS. In that case, what happens to the scholarship money?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. In other words, he is going to be using it. It will string out. There is no scholarship money left in this bill, I will point out to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. On page 37, section 604, I find this language:

Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of \$2,000 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate degree, \$2,200 for the second such year—

And so forth. And then an additional increase of \$400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents. Is that still in the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes, it is.

Mr. GROSS. Then this is a family support bill in addition to all the rest of the emoluments that are included in it?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. If the gentleman wants to call it that, he may. We do not call it that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. In reading the bill, I do not find there is any requirement of citizenship. If that be true, that there is no requirement of citizenship, would the son of one of the attachés at the Russian Embassy qualify under the terms of this bill to be trained in mathematics and the sciences?

Mr. GROSS. Let us ask the committee. Will someone on the committee answer the question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The requirement is that the scholar be a citizen of the State.

Mr. GROSS. That is in the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Where is it to be found?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is to be found on page 7, line 3:

The term "resident" when used with respect to any State shall have the meaning established by regulations of the Commissioner and shall include a citizen of the United States who is domiciled in such State but is living outside of any State.

Mr. GROSS. Has that been left in the bill? Can the gentleman tell us positively that that has not been stricken by one of the numerous amendments that have been adopted?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That has not been stricken; it is still in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask another question. Is there any provision in this bill to take care of the 1,300 schoolchildren in the District of Columbia who cannot go to school because they do not have shoes?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to point out that the language read by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] said that it would include citizens, but it did not say anything about whom it excludes. It is gracious of the proponents to include Americans.

Mr. GROSS. I would expect to find foreigners provided for somehow or other in this bill, especially when it comes to getting some money.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. In view of the questionable legitimacy of this bill, having been conceived in the minds of a number of the educators of this House, I wonder if it would not be a good idea, at the proper time, to demand a reading of the engrossed copy of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. That would be up to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I just wondered whether the gentleman from Iowa intended to ask for an engrossed copy to be read.

Mr. GROSS. I said that would be up to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. What does the gentleman from Iowa think about such a suggestion?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman thinks it is a good idea but that I ought to offer it; is that right?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; if the gentleman desires to do so.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I notice that when some of the smooth-talking Russian students were here that one of them was 35 years old. I wonder if there is any age limit on beneficiaries provided for in this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the preferential motion be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 86, noes 117.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I am for this legislation even though I did not approve of some of the amendments that have been added to it. I urge my colleagues of the House, as I said yesterday, to consider this as being a red-letter day in that we are doing some-

thing for the greatest asset our Nation has, our boys and girls. I sincerely hope this measure will have the approval of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, one of the stories that seems to be circulating is that now that the scholarship provision is out of the bill the President will not be for it. I would say rather the contrary is true. I think that should make it far more appealing and more supportable on our side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think there has been enough talk on this bill. I think the Members know enough about it now that they will vote for it.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the majority leader if he can give us the program for the rest of the day, tomorrow, and next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. If we dispose of this bill today, I shall ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until Monday. If, for any reason, the bill should not be disposed of today, I would be forced into the position where we would have to meet tomorrow. I hope that situation will not arise.

On Monday there are 11 bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia to be considered. They are as follows:

H. R. 573, prohibit operation budget planning services.

H. R. 8470, courts, examination, communications ministers of religion.

H. R. 10160, revise and modernize the fish and game laws.

H. R. 13406, amend Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

S. 3827, amend Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942.

H. R. 8735, increase, teachers' retirement and annuity fund.

H. R. 12963, amend Business Corporation Act.

H. R. 12969, authorization, sewage disposal.

House Joint Resolution 630, southwest freeway bill.

H. R. 10622, increase authorization, hospital construction.

H. R. 13655, pregrant expenses, Sibley Hospital.

There are 16 suspensions to be considered on Monday. They are:

H. R. 13673, donation, surplus property, fire department.

Senate Joint Resolution 135, water, sea, demonstration plant.

S. 3468, Indians, road improvement, Navaho and Hopi Reservations.

H. R. 9121, Hawaii, provide geophysical institute.

S. 4009, increase authorization, Washoe reclamation project.

House Joint Resolution 585, Central Valley project, study and report.

S. 4059, change of name, Reorganization Plan No. 1.

S. 1903, Federal employees, travel expenses.

H. R. 13558, incorporation, Military Order of Purple Heart.

H. R. 12802, amend Bankruptcy Act, regarding taxes.

H. R. 12292, retired judges, assignment to active duty.

H. R. 3369, maintenance and travel expenses, judges.

H. R. 13272, define "organize."

H. R. 13311, deportation, review of orders.

H. R. 9020, Agriculture, Packers, and Stockyards Act.

H. R. 13254, agriculture food additives, amendment of 1958.

There are primaries in the States of Arkansas, Idaho, and New York on Tuesday.

If any rollcall votes are necessary, except on rules, on Monday and Tuesday, they will be put over until Wednesday if consent is obtained. That is the understanding of the leadership on both sides.

On Tuesday, the following bills are programmed:

H. R. 8002, improve methods, budget estimates.

H. R. 10360, continuation of Mexican farm-labor program.

On Wednesday, the Private Calendar will be called. Then the bill S. 3683, the distressed areas redevelopment program will be brought up.

The rest of the week depends on rules being reported out of the Committee on Rules. Those bills follow:

S. 4035, renewal of housing and urban communities.

S. 1869, TVA, assistance financing power programs.

S. 4036, minerals stabilization production bill.

Mr. MARTIN. I have had a good many requests from members of the Massachusetts Bar Association as well as other bar associations throughout the country about the bill providing for extra judges. I do not see any mention of that. There is quite a demand for that bill so as to improve the work and the orderly procedure of the courts. We have been told that in some sections of the country they are 4 years behind which creates quite a situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill has been ordered to be reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary. It has not been filed yet. I understand that it will be filed the early part of next week. Therefore, a rule will have to be obtained. Thereafter there is the question of whether it can be programmed before we adjourn.

Mr. MARTIN. It looks as though it is a long way from being considered by the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Disclosing my mind to my friend and, of course, to the Members of the House as frankly as I possibly can, I would think it would be a long while.

Mr. MARTIN. That means that the bill is as far from being considered as we are from adjournment?

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish my friend would not try to put me on record as to that. I am trying to be as frank as I possibly can.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts a question. We have heard so often how the gentleman projects his mind. Could he not project his mind far enough to tell us a little more definitely about that?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have been projecting my mind so much that I hesitate to do it again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts be kind enough to repeat what he said about the area redevelopment bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. The rule has been reported out of the committee. If it is reported to the House I am programming it for next Wednesday. Of course, the gentleman knows when a rule is reported out of the Committee on Rules, it does not have to be reported to the House for 3 legislative days. Thereafter, there are 7 legislative days in which a Member in charge of the rule might prevent its consideration. I am in hopes the situation will be such that we can bring the bill up on Wednesday next.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. But the Committee on Rules agreed to grant a rule; did they not?

Mr. McCORMACK. They have granted a rule.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The delay, of course, is by the chairman of the Committee on Rules?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I would not say the responsibility for the delay lies there. Any statement as to the delay would not be justified at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] for 1 minute, to close debate on the bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, it is true that I have felt a sense of disappointment at one of the titles of the bill being excluded. But I would like to say that we have a good bill. We have a substantial bill. We have a bill too that I am authorized to say for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is approved by the administration, but undoubtedly with the same disappointment with respect to the section which was deleted. We have a good bill, and I urge the Members of the House to pass the bill.

In closing the debate on this bill, I want to express my deepest and sincerest appreciation to the members of the Subcommittee on Special Education, of which I am privileged to serve as chair-

man. They are the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]; the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN]; the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]; and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON]; and to the Subcommittee on Special Education, consisting of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], known everywhere for his deep interest in America's schools, who serves as chairman of that subcommittee. The members of his subcommittee are the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF]; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]; and on the minority side the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]; the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LAFORE].

These 2 subcommittees have worked together beautifully, as have the members of the entire Committee on Education and Labor.

They have all worked together on this subject for nearly a year. The bill, though not perfect, represents an honest and sincere effort on the part of all to answer the challenges which America faces in the field of education. I am confident that you will so accept it.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, there is no more important problem in our Nation, and perhaps the world, than the successful training and utilization of our talented young people.

Conservative estimates are that at least 100,000 talented boys and girls who are graduated every year from high school do not go on for more education because they do not have the financial resources. This is a loss we cannot afford from any standpoint, social, cultural, or military.

It is true that many young men and women without resources, but with determination and resourcefulness, do manage to obtain scholarships, grants-in-aid and loans to make college and graduate school education possible for them.

I do not wish to underestimate motivation, but I do believe that in too many instances a young person never glimpses the possibility of higher education because of the cost and the obligation he feels to help his family.

I do not believe there should be an emphasis on help in a particular subject or field. Certainly we need outstanding students in the field of humanities as well as in the physical science area.

On March 27 of this year I offered an amendment before this House which would increase the monetary sum available to the National Science Foundation for social sciences research. The amendment would not have increased the total appropriation sum, but it was not adopted. I received many approving comments and expressions of opinion showing that my feelings were shared by many colleagues.

I believe our life today does boil down to the old question of survival of the fit-

test. Are we fit if we do not apply the knowledge we have accumulated about human behavior and if we do not push forward the frontiers of our knowledge in political science and economics, for example?

There are a number of urgent needs facing Congress this session. One of them is the matter of positive support in the field of education. We are fighting a battle in this field today with the enemies of our democratic way of life.

When our respected colleague from Oregon, the Honorable EDITH GREEN, returned earlier this year from a survey of Russian educational facilities, we were made more vividly aware of the urgent need for congressional action in this field.

I urge adoption of H. R. 13247 as amended. My feeling is shared by the considerable number of Oregonians who have written me endorsing this legislation.

On behalf of my constituents I commend the devoted efforts of the hard-working House Committee on Education and Labor for bringing this legislation before us this week.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I wish to give voice to my complete accord with, and in support of, H. R. 13247 when and if the Powell amendment is adopted.

It is agreed that its identical words have been incorporated in at least 12 measures passed by this body in the last 3 years; therefore, the assumption is inescapable that this safeguard has been considered to have merit.

No one will deny that vigilance in the protection of the rights of mankind is essential to their preservation; in fact, history is made up of man's constant struggle to overcome oppression and to preserve these rights already inherently certain; further, to add an ever-increasing measure of freedom and equality to his existence.

In religion, the fight for tolerance was long and difficult. In the field of human rights of freedom of worship this fight has raged relentlessly over the ages, and still goes on. The women of this country fought a glorious battle to secure their voting rights and were victorious because of their courage and persistent crusade.

It is, therefore, apparent that no minorities can indulge in the retiring luxury of complacency; on the contrary, alert vigilance must always be the watchword.

The Powell amendment is a protection to religion and to the womanhood of our Nation. Also, it serves the men of all races, colors, and creeds. I, therefore, support this measure as amended.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the results intended to be achieved by this bill—H. R. 13247—are most laudable. The committee should be highly commended for its efforts in presenting us with a reasonable approach to this problem, and, particularly I think, for incorporating into the bill provisions designed to insure that the Federal Government will not now deeply invade the traditional authority to regulate our educational processes that has been enjoyed by our State and local governments.

I have no doubt that the bill, if passed, will have the effect of encouraging those

same State and local governments to increase their efforts to improve our national educational program, and will serve to assist many deserving and capable high school graduates to continue their education. Nothing ever being quite perfect, there are, of course, some provisions in the committee bill which I do not think are necessary or justifiable, but perhaps these will be cured by amendment. Overall, however, I believe the bill is entitled to the support of those who favor Federal aid to education.

Mr. Chairman, please notice my emphasis on that phrase, those who favor Federal aid to education, because, it seems to me that that is the basic issue here today. This is an issue much more fundamental than whether this bill goes too far or not far enough, or whether this amendment or that amendment will improve or damage it.

It is my understanding that, with minor exceptions, this measure, if passed, would represent the first Federal invasion of the general aid-to-education field in nearly 100 years—since, in fact, the so-called Morrill Land-Grant College Act was passed in 1862. This, this, can deservedly be called an historic measure.

Let us briefly recall that, while for years there have been those educators and legislators who have believed that education must eventually become a Federal function, the real impetus for this bill was born out of the shock and turmoil all Americans experienced when the Soviet sputnik flashed across our skies, and it became clear to most of us that there was a real danger of our falling behind the Soviets in the field of scientific education and research. Since then, numerous surveys and reports have been made and written concerning the alleged shortcomings of our educational system. Such a soul searching, I believe, has been good for America, especially for those citizens who are parents or who are administrative or teaching cogs in our national educational machine that has apparently been more in need of an overhaul and reconditioning that we had imagined.

All of this is why, Mr. Chairman, this measure is now called not just an Education Act, but a National Defense Education Act, and is referred to variously as a crash program, an emergency measure, and as stopgap legislation. But emergency or not, Mr. Chairman, the Federal foot will be in the educational door the moment this bill passes. We all know that, and we cannot ignore it. What does it mean? Well, despite all the assurances of the proponents to the effect that this is a temporary or short-term measure only, and will not peril local controls, I for one, fear this figurative foot in the door will eventually open wide the door for a slow erosion of home rule over the education of our youth. The founders of our Government properly recognized that the best government is that which is closest to the people. I believe that this is especially true in the field of education.

Everyone in this House would, I think, deplore any extensive loss of State and local control over education, but, all well-intentioned pronouncements to the

contrary, I predict that this legislation, innocent and necessary as it seems, cannot help but result in a gradual, perhaps scarcely noticeable, shift in educational responsibility from the traditional State-local pattern to a Washington-centered education system. This bill will probably pass, after being watered down by amendments so as to be palatable to almost all of us except those who feel as I do. I can only hope, therefore, that my doubts are not justified, but since I fear they are, I cannot support this measure.

Although I would like to talk about Federal fiscal solvency, and discuss the question of scholarship need, I will not say more, except to extend my regrets for my vote to those able and conscientious educators of my own district who have urged my support of H. R. 13247. To them I would also like to add my congratulations on the job that they and others of their profession in the great State of New York are doing toward meeting the severe educational challenges of today. I believe that if all States had as enlightened and progressive an educational program as does New York, there would be no real need for us to concern ourselves here at all. I often wonder if those States who say they are financially unable to do as good a job are actually as unable as they are unwilling to face up to their responsibilities as we in New York have done. Perhaps in time they shall, but not if we partially relieve them of those responsibilities by taking this proposed tiny step with giant import into a new area of big government—a step forward which we can never take back.

DOLLARS FOR SCHOLARS

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is one of the most important measures of this congressional session. Both our future as a democracy and also the very crucial nature of our national survival during the next generation are at stake. This legislation needs our most serious consideration and approval. I should like to confine my remarks specifically to title 3, Loans to Students in Institutions of Higher Education, as this section corresponds with my student loan bill, H. R. 5479. It is designed to permit students of needy means to borrow money to secure a higher education during these critical times.

First, education has become known as a "right" in a democracy. The very nature of a free and democratic society cries for an informed electorate. All of the people must know and be trained to be able to know and solve the needs of our country. Historically, public education has developed with our American democracy. We have free education through secondary schools.

However, higher education—the college years—is as yet an economic problem to our citizens. For some generations college education was regarded as the domain of only wealthy families. The GI bill struck down those connotations. The GI bill filled an unforeseen vacuum during the critical years following World War II. The GI bill treated everyone alike. It made higher education more democratic. In a technical society which grows more complicated

every day, need for higher education grows even more apparent. We need the trained talent for producing television, for new designs of modern defense, and for the very advance know-how of space travel. If we are to have an informed electorate, a substantial portion of the population must also know enough to decide intelligently our country's domestic and foreign policies. A free society must have access to the facts or it will fall. This is basically the approach of student loans in bringing education to those who previously could not afford a college degree, and much in the nature of the GI bill which is no longer in effect.

Second, student loans permit more brains in college. As a public high school teacher for many years, I was distraught whenever anyone of my students had the will but not the funds to go to college. They were capable students. They were Americans to the nth degree. They had bigger vitality but personal problems or family problems, all of an economic nature, made impossible their college education. These students were lost to the technical benefit of our country. But we cannot disregard any longer the need of these talents when we measure the future of the United States industrial potential, world position, and the American place in the space age of our future. This will take brains.

Third, America's whole nature can be boiled down to three words—"land of opportunity." We have a free country. We have a tradition of individual land ownership, individual enterprise, individual initiative and concern for the individual. Opportunity to go to college is the latest horizon to face us in our comparatively young land of 182 years. We have seen destitute students go by unnoticed. We must recognize this tremendous natural resource—the fountain of our future. Title III provides for long-term, low-interest loans to undergraduate and graduate students to enable them to continue their higher education. The provisions permit loans not to exceed \$1,000 per academic year nor a total of \$5,000 to any one student. The student may repay or pay any part of the loan in less time than 10 years but within 10 years. Liability for repayment would be canceled upon death or permanent total disability of the borrower. The previous experience with student loans indicates this is practically the only loss—a small price to pay for such opportunity to young people. May I point up from the committee report a quotation from a well-experienced citizen and director of student loans at the University of Minnesota, Mr. George B. Risty:

In these years we have always had much greater demand for loan funds than we have had for scholarships. Maybe it is because we lack some of the scholarship money and, therefore, we aren't able to help as many * * *. We have granted more loans than we have scholarships in all the years I have been there * * *. We are running through approximately 100 and some loans a week and it will run some over \$300,000 in this academic year.

I want to thank the Education Committee for their very capable work and consideration on my testimony presented to them. They have taken a tremendous step toward the future of our great land of democracy and opportunity. I urge you wholeheartedly to support title III—loans to students in institutions of higher education, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This is truly dollars for scholars.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL] for pointing out yesterday that until such time as the quantity and quality of those in the teaching profession are improved, we are not going to be able to solve the school crises which face us.

I am definitely in favor of the National Defense Education Act, H. R. 13247, the bill now pending and supported the rule on the same when it was up for a vote yesterday.

One of the most important problems before us in this country today is the drastic shortage of teachers who are properly trained and qualified in the various fields of education. The recent Rockefeller Report on Education stated:

No educational system can be better than its teachers. Yet we face severe problems both in the supply of teachers at all levels and in their quality. * * * The danger of a decline in the quality of our corps of teachers is obvious. Even today it is in need of improvement: as of 1956, 33 percent of the elementary teachers did not hold bachelor of arts degrees and more than 21 percent of all public-school teachers had less than 4 years of college.

Our teachers have long been overburdened and underpaid, and with the increased student enrollments each year in every State in the Union, it has been impossible to keep pace in providing sufficient teachers, even though there has been a forced decline in standards of preparations.

Teaching has always been an honored and dedicated profession, and to secure adequately trained teachers we must continue our efforts to improve the plight of the individual teacher, and must carefully reanalyze our entire educational system.

The economic situation is, of course, in this day of increased living costs, of paramount concern. Additional financial considerations which will provide an inducement to enter the profession, and an incentive to remain therein, must be considered and put into effect without delay.

The initial steps toward improvement of our educational system must be, and should be, taken on the local level. However, when it is impossible or impractical for the State or the community to undertake such changes, then it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to extend assistance.

This bill now before us will encourage many of our young people, who would otherwise have no opportunity of furthering their education, to pursue higher learning at the college level, and would enable us to take advantage of and to develop the vast intellectual re-

sources, which otherwise would be lost to us. This is one proposal under the Federal aid to education program which would to a great extent contribute to the alleviation of the shortages not only in the field of education, but in other critical fields such as engineering, science, mathematics, and so forth, where trained personnel are in short supply.

I hope that the bill will be passed by the House, and subsequently approved by the Senate prior to adjournment.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 13247 and to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ELLIOTT, and the other members of the Committee on Education and Labor for their long and thorough study of the need for advancing our educational standards.

The national defense education bill before us does not satisfy everyone, of course; however, it is a step in the right direction if we intend to offer better and more advanced educational opportunities to our girls and boys.

Shortly after sputnik, it was my pleasure to introduce one of the first bills in the House on this subject and I know I speak for a majority of the educational leaders when I say that we appreciate the committee's action in bringing this bill up for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will overwhelmingly adopt this measure and that it will become law in order that we may speed up our educational efforts.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, title II, the scholarship section, of the National Defense Education Act has brought down practically all of the criticism that has been leveled against the bill.

As I stated in my former speech we should not let our qualms against the scholarship section title II cause us to destroy the other eight sections upon which there is considerable agreement.

This has been my position from the outset. First I worked with the committee leadership to announce that they would reduce the scholarships from 20,000 to 10,000 and restrict them to need.

Then in my speeches I talked primarily for other sections of the bill. My reply to my colleagues who complained against title II has been: "If you don't like the scholarship provision amend it out." And finally when the gentleman from Minnesota moved to strike title II I supported his motion because I felt it was the thing to do under the circumstances.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 8, page A9, I stated:

In view of our unprecedented national debt and the urgency for an unpredictable expenditure of funds for the Nation's defense, it would seem inadvisable to inaugurate a billion-dollar program to further endanger our fiscal structure if any reasonable alternative is available.

I believe there is an alternative—one that will appeal to the commonsense of every boy or girl who wants an education and is willing to assume the responsibility for its attainment—one that will eliminate the ne'er-do-wells who, with no fixed objective, would

be happy to enjoy campus association at no personal expense.

The alternative is a revolving student loan fund—a means whereby an ambitious student can assume the responsibility of furthering his education on his own, with the provision that the loan would be subject to repayment on completion of education and after his earnings begin. The cost of a loan program would be small as compared to Secretary Folsom's plan. The student would prize his education in the knowledge he had earned it. He would have learned the value of money, developed traits of strong character, and acquired the ability to contribute to the welfare of society and his country.

I find myself unable to support H. R. 13247 in its original form, believing the scholarship features will fall far short of their purpose in addition to involving the already defunct Treasury in further deficit.

However, with title II stricken from the bill, leaving the loan features intact, I will vote for final passage if motion to recommit fails.

I still believe if the bill is referred back to committee its provisions will be greatly simplified and improved.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, the backward peasant nation that was the Soviet Union 30 years ago has raised itself to a high level of technological accomplishment—even though it may have been at great cost in human suffering. Today, Soviet missiles and rockets face us, to say nothing of a vast fleet of missile-equipped submarines and huge standing armies. America is confronted with a shrewd and ruthless mortal enemy—Soviet Russia, a country under the leadership of atheistic men whose announced objective is the complete mastery of the world, men who are merciless, men who are ambitious, men who will stop at nothing to achieve their goal.

Nikita Khrushchev has boasted that the Soviets will be supreme in nuclear power, in consumer-goods production, in cultural activities, in agricultural production, in education. "We will bury you," he has boldly and arrogantly stated to us.

It is time we realized that the Communists are waging all-out war upon us and that we are locked in a gigantic and momentous struggle which will demand every resource of our intelligence and our spirit if we are to survive. We are in a one-game world series, and we cannot afford to lose any more innings. The Russian sputniks and our own satellites are signs in the sky that the race between the Communist world and the free world has entered a new, a deeper, a more profound dimension. And this race is to the swift; this battle is to the strong. To effectively compete in this contest, there must be a fundamental change in American attitude toward the intellectuals—the scholars in our midst.

America needs more eggheads and fewer fatheads. It was Soviet eggheads who got the sputniks off the ground, and it will be American eggheads who get our Nation off the ground if we but give them the support they need. Frankly, I am on an egghead search. I am looking for more scientists and engineers, more mathematicians and technicians.

Not all eggheads are geniuses. Not all eggheads are potential scientists and en-

gineers. An egghead is simply a thinking, reflecting person who may well have a strong streak of creativity in him or her. The basic hallmarks are a concern primarily with ideas; a restless, inquiring mind; a dedication to something higher and outside himself. Some are hard boiled and some are soft boiled, but we need them all, and it is time that the American people and our United States Government decided to make it possible for a far higher percentage of young potential scholars to move into positions of leadership.

Last fall at Chicago, at a conference of more than a thousand educators and laymen interested in education, the point was made repeatedly that high-school students are capable of handling much more solid intellectual fare than many are now receiving. The quality and the intensity of our higher education can be rather sharply increased by changes in the curricula. This is imperative when we think of the degree the Russian high-school graduate is being force fed with scientific education.

Recently I learned this from the United States Office of Education's specialist in Soviet education:

The emphasis on science in Soviet schools contrasts sharply with the situation in the United States. Whereas each of the more than 1 million Soviet students graduating from secondary schools last June had taken 5 years of chemistry, 5 of biology, 10 of mathematics—including algebra, geometry, and trigonometry—less than one-third of a total of approximately the same number of our American high school graduates had taken as much as a single year in chemistry.

That is only a fraction of the story. In the Soviet Union the school week is 6 days—not 5. The school hours are longer. Study at home is more exacting. Examinations are more severe. A Russian child learns biology in grade 4, foreign languages in grade 5, physics and algebra and geometry in grade 6. Grade 7 teaches chemistry. Astronomy and calculus are taught in grade 10. This Russian data surely demonstrates that many American high-school students could take a considerably richer diet of education, with a strong seasoning of the physical sciences.

It is evident therefore, Mr. Chairman, that a program must be devised which will enable America to regain the leadership in scientific and other fields. This is an absolute necessity if our Nation is to be secure in the immediate years ahead. Early in the session I introduced legislation designed to do this, and I am pleased to give my support today to the bill before us which is very similar to the bill I introduced.

H. R. 13247 will assist in the improvement and strengthening of our educational system at all levels and it will encourage able students to continue their education beyond high school. Federal control of education is prohibited. The primary responsibility for education, now and in the future, should remain with the States and local communities and higher educational institutions, but the Federal Government can and should play a constructive role.

Mr. Chairman, the challenge that confronts America requires the fullest pos-

sible development of the abilities of our young people. American education, consequently, bears a grave responsibility in our times. Our very survival as a free Nation depends to a considerable extent upon the quality of education we provide for our sons and daughters, the men and women who will chart the future course of this Republic. We must do our best to find potential leaders in science and in industry. We need technicians, we need diplomats, we need engineers and scientists, we need young people who can speak other languages, men and women who can probe the atom as well as the universe. The discovery of a single scientific genius can upset the military balance of power. The same discovery can contribute more to man's prosperity than the discovery of some vast new body of iron ore. The discovery of a single scientific genius may mean the difference in freedom and slavery, peace and war.

Education in the United States has become the neglected stepchild of American progress. Not only education from the standpoint of financial support, but education from the standpoint of substantive content. In recent years ours has been an educational system that has flaunted as an ideal, almost as if it were a religion, not the exceptional man, not talent, certainly not genius. It has flaunted the chap who knew how to win friends and influence people. It has not been what one knows that matters, or what one has achieved, or could achieve. There has been a consequent breakdown of discipline that has corroded the home and debased authority. The handwriting is on the wall. We must act now lest in the end we are weighed in the balances and, like Belshazzar, found wanting. I urge the support of this bill.

(Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I will vote against recommitment to the committee and for final passage of the Elliott National Defense Education Act of 1958, endorsed by President Eisenhower.

We need the full Elliott bill H. R. 13247 as well as the addition of provisions for adequate school facilities, and broad plans of assistance to local school districts for financing an adequate general education program including elementary as well as high school construction. I am sorry that the national-defense scholarships in title II have been cut and urge that they be restored by the Senate.

I strongly urge the passage of this legislation so that it will go to the Senate for action, and we can work to see what can be salvaged at the time of the conference between the two Houses. I have felt so strongly that we should adopt the Elliott bill that I cosponsored a bill similar to the Elliott bill, H. R. 13679.

I agree with the National Education Association and the recommendations of Joseph Siegman of Moon Township schools, Allegheny County, Pa., the Pennsylvania Education Association legislative representative. We in Congress must act now to assist education in the United States, to encourage the expan-

sion and improvement of educational programs in every field, as well as to emphasize scientific and mathematics programs to strengthen the national defense and to meet critical national needs. We must act at once.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOGARTY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 675, he reported the same back to the House, with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GWINN. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GWINN moves to recommit the bill H. R. 13247 to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 140, nays 233, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—140

Abbitt	Brownson	Feighan
Abernethy	Budge	Fisher
Adair	Burleson	Flynt
Alexander	Bush	Forrester
Alger	Byrne, Ill.	Fountain
Allen, Ill.	Byrnes, Wis.	Gary
Andersen,	Cannon	Gathings
H. Carl	Chiperfield	Gavin
Arends	Church	Gross
Ashmore	Clevenger	Gwinn
Barden	Collier	Haley
Bates	Cramer	Halleck
Beamer	Cunningham,	Harden
Becker	Nebr.	Hardy
Belcher	Curtis, Mo.	Harrison, Nebr.
Bennett, Fla.	Dague	Harrison, Va.
Berry	Davis, Ga.	Harvey
Betts	Dennison	Hemphill
Bolton	Derounian	Henderson
Bonner	Devereux	Herlong
Bow	Dorn, S. C.	Hess
Bray	Dowdy	Hiestand
Brown, Ga.	Durham	Hill
Brown, Ohio	Fallon	Hoeven

Hoffman	O'Hara, Minn.
Jensen	Passman
Johansen	Pelly
Jonas	Pilcher
Kilgore	Pillion
Kitchin	Poff
Krueger	Ray
Laird	Reece, Tenn.
LeCompte	Reed
Lipscomb	Rees, Kans.
McCulloch	Rhodes, Ariz.
McGregor	Riley
McMillan	Robison, N. Y.
Mack, Wash.	Rogers, Tex.
Marshall	Rutherford
Matthews	Sadlak
Miller, Md.	St. George
Miller, Nebr.	Saylor
Miller, N. Y.	Schenck
Minshall	Scherer
Mumma	Schwengel
Neal	Scott, N. C.
Nicholson	Scrivner
Nimtz	Scudder

NAYS—233

Addonizio	Granahan
Albert	Grant
Allen, Calif.	Gray
Andrews	Green, Oreg.
Anfuso	Green, Pa.
Ashley	Griffin
Aspinall	Griffiths
Auchincloss	Gubser
Avery	Hagen
Ayres	Hale
Bailey	Harris
Baldwin	Haskell
Barrett	Hays, Ark.
Bass, N. H.	Hays, Ohio
Bass, Tenn.	Healey
Baumhart	Heslton
Beckworth	Holfield
Bennett, Mich.	Holland
Bentley	Holmes
Blatnik	Holt
Boggs	Holtzman
Boland	Horan
Bolling	Hosmer
Bosch	Huddleston
Boyle	Hull
Breeding	Hyde
Brooks, Tex.	Ikard
Broomfield	Jackson
Brown, Mo.	Jarman
Broyhill	Jennings
Byrd	Johnson
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.
Canfield	Judd
Carnahan	Karsten
Carrigg	Kean
Cederberg	Kearns
Chamberlain	Keating
Chelf	Kee
Chenoweth	Kelly, N. Y.
Clark	Kilday
Coad	King
Coffin	Kirwan
Cooley	Knox
Corbett	Knutson
Coudert	Lafore
Cretella	Lane
Cunningham,	Lankford
Iowa	Lennon
Curtin	Libonati
Curtis, Mass.	McCarthy
Dawson, Ill.	McCormack
Dawson, Utah	McDonough
Delaney	McFall
Dent	McGovern
Denton	McIntire
Diggs	McIntosh
Dingell	McVey
Dixon	Macdonald
Dollinger	Machrowicz
Donohue	Mack, Ill.
Dooley	Madden
Dorn, N. Y.	Magnuson
Doyle	Mahon
Dwyer	Mailliard
Edmondson	Martin
Elliot	May
Everett	Meader
Farbstein	Merrow
Fascell	Metcalfe
Fenton	Miller, Calif.
Flood	Mills
Fogarty	Mitchell
Forand	Montoya
Ford	Moore
Frelinghuysen	Morano
Fulton	Morgan
Garmatz	Moulder
George	Multer

Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stauffer
Talle
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Vorys
Weaver
Westland
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.

NOT VOTING—57

Anderson,	Friedel	Morrison
Mont.	Glenn	Moss
Baker	Gordon	Murray
Baring	Gregory	Preston
Blitch	Hébert	Radwan
Boykin	Hillings	Rivers
Brooks, La.	James	Robeson, Va.
Buckley	Jenkins	Shelley
Burdick	Jones, Mo.	Shuford
Celler	Kearney	Sieminski
Christopher	Keogh	Smith, Kans.
Colmer	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Spence
Dellay	Landrum	Taber
Dies	Latham	Taylor
Eberharter	Lesinski	Thompson, La.
Engle	Loser	Wharton
Evins	Mason	Winstead
Fino	Michel	
Frazier	Morris	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of Virginia for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Shuford for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mrs. Blitch for, with Mr. Engle against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Wharton against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Glenn against.

Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Moss against.

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Gregory against.

Mr. Taber for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Evins against.

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Friedel against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Robeson of Virginia for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Mr. James for, with Mr. Anderson of Montana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the question have to be taken on the engrossment and third reading of the bill?

The SPEAKER. That point has been passed and the House has just voted on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on August 6, 1958, the Presi-

dent approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 855. An act to designate the dam being constructed in connection with the Eagle Gorge Reservoir project on the Green River, Wash., as the "Howard A. Hanson Dam";

H. R. 985. An act to provide that chief judges of circuit courts and chief judges of district courts having three or more judges shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70;

H. R. 1574. An act for the relief of Albert Hyrapiet;

H. R. 6824. An act for the relief of the family of Joseph A. Morgan;

H. R. 7140. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a registrar at the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7267. An act for the relief of Charles J. Jennings;

H. R. 7375. An act for the relief of Edward J. Doyle and Mrs. Edward J. (Billie M.) Doyle;

H. R. 7660. An act for the relief of Dan Hill;

H. R. 7684. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer to David J. Carlson and Gerald J. Geyer certain interests of the United States in an invention;

H. R. 7941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry B. Kesler;

H. R. 7944. An act for the relief of the Spera Construction Co.;

H. R. 8147. An act for the relief of Kenneth W. Lenghart;

H. R. 8252. An act to amend section 3237 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the place at which certain offenses against the income tax laws take place;

H. R. 9222. An act for the relief of Dr. Edgar Scott;

H. R. 9885. An act for the relief of Frank A. Gyescek;

H. R. 10260. An act for the relief of Natale H. Bellocchi and Oscar R. Edmondson;

H. R. 10426. An act to provide that the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (Public Law 627), 84th Cong., ch. 462, 2d sess.) shall be amended to increase the period in which actual construction shall commence on rights-of-way acquired in anticipation of such construction from 5 years to 7 years following the fiscal year in which such request is made;

H. R. 11305. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds to finance the 1961 meeting of the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses;

H. R. 11549. An act to provide for the preparation of a proposed revision of the Canal Zone Code, together with appropriate ancillary material;

H. R. 12541. An act to promote the national defense by providing for reorganization of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12948. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2888) entitled "An act to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans"; agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and ap-

points Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ALBENI FALLS RESERVOIR PROJECT, IDAHO—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 13209, an act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Albeni Falls Reservoir project, Idaho, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 8, 1958.

PORTSMOUTH PAY BILL

(Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to learn yesterday that the Armed Services Committee, in the other body has decided to seek repassage of the Portsmouth pay bill over the veto of the President. I am hopeful that the necessary votes can be obtained in that body and that the House thereupon will also override the veto.

This legislation has been passed unanimously by both the House and Senate. It would correct an unjust and deplorable situation in which employees at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard at Kittery, Maine, receive wages far lower than those at the Boston shipyard, although the two facilities are only 60 miles apart.

The President vetoed the measure because he feared a precedent and felt that such wages should not be adjusted by legislation, although he recognized the inequities. He recommended an administrative adjustment instead. But I should like to point out the reason I sponsored this legislation was that the Navy had refused to adjust these wages by administrative action. We had urged such an approach for many years, but to no avail.

Since we could obtain no adjustment by the Navy, the only avenue left for us was through legislation. I realize that the President has directed the Navy to review the situation and make such adjustments as the review indicates are warranted. My colleague, Mr. MERROW, and I had suggested to the President in a conference last Monday, that he direct administrative action if he would not sign the bill.

I have urged Secretary of Navy Gates to make these adjustments, but I emphatically do not believe further review is necessary, since both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees have

already studied this problem thoroughly and found immediate action justified.

Whether the Navy will act promptly is difficult to say. But in view of its past refusal to act, I think the wisest and quickest course would be to make a legislative adjustment. For that reason, I am seeking to have this veto overridden and I hope the House will act favorably if the measure gets by the other body.

The morale of the Portsmouth workers is extremely low since their pay bill was vetoed. Yet this yard is the Navy's No. 1 submarine facility, and was just recently awarded construction of a Polaris submarine, one of our most important deterrent weapons. We must have the utmost efficiency at this shipyard in the interests of national defense, and repassage of this legislation by a two-thirds majority will make certain we have it.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend the remarks they made on the bill H. R. 13247, and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the same bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 156, I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "no." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 159 I am not recorded. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

REPORT FROM WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Saturday to file reports on the bills H. R. 731, H. R. 5804, and H. R. 5944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

Calendar No. 2370

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 13247

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 11, 1958

Received; read twice and ordered to be placed on the calendar

AN ACT

To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That this Act, divided into titles and sections according
4 to the following table of contents, may be cited as the
5 “National Defense Education Act of 1958”.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 101. Findings and declaration of policy.
- Sec. 102. Federal control of education prohibited.
- Sec. 103. Definitions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER
EDUCATION

- Sec. 201. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 202. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 203. Payment of Federal capital contributions.
- Sec. 204. Conditions of agreements.
- Sec. 205. Terms of loans.
- Sec. 206. Distributions of assets from student loan funds.
- Sec. 207. Loans to institutions.
- Sec. 208. Administrative provisions.

TITLE III—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS,
AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

- Sec. 301. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 302. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 303. State plans.
- Sec. 304. Payments to States.

TITLE IV—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

- Sec. 401. Language institutes.
- Sec. 402. Language and area centers.
- Sec. 403. Research and studies.
- Sec. 404. Appropriations authorized.

TITLE V—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

- Sec. 501. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 502. Number of fellowships.
- Sec. 503. Award of fellowships and approval of institutions.
- Sec. 504. Fellowship stipends.
- Sec. 505. Fellowship conditions.

TITLE VI—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND
ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

- Sec. 601. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 602. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 603. State plans.
- Sec. 604. Payments to States.

PART B—INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

- Sec. 621. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 622. Purpose.
- Sec. 623. Contract authority.
- Sec. 624. Stipends.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILI-
ZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA
FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

- Sec. 701. Appropriations authorized; functions of Commissioner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Sec. 801. Administration.
- Sec. 802. Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.
- Sec. 803. Disapproval of, and failure to comply with, State plans.
- Sec. 804. Judicial review.
- Sec. 805. Method of payment.
- Sec. 806. Administrative appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 807. Acceptance of gifts and bequests.
- Sec. 808. Allotments to Territories and possessions.
- Sec. 809. Advisory committees.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. This requires programs that will demonstrate our country's recognition of and esteem for those of our students who have striven to develop their intellectual abilities to the fullest extent, and will make available greater intellectual opportunities that are challenging to our youth.

The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense.

1 To meet the present educational emergency requires ad-
2 ditional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore
3 the purpose of this Act to provide substantial assistance in
4 various forms to individuals for study at institutions of higher
5 education, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to
6 insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity
7 to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

8 FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

9 SEC. 102. Nothing contained in this Act shall be con-
10 strued to authorize any department, agency, officer, or em-
11 ployee of the United States to exercise any direction, super-
12 vision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction,
13 administration, or personnel of any educational institution
14 or school system.

15 DEFINITIONS

16 SEC. 103. As used in this Act—

17 (a) The term “State” means a State, Alaska, Hawaii,
18 Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone,
19 Guam, or the Virgin Islands, except that as used in section
20 302 and 602, such term does not include Alaska, Hawaii,
21 Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

22 (b) The term “institution of higher education” means
23 an educational institution in any State which (1) admits
24 as regular students only persons having a certificate of grad-
25 uation from a school providing secondary education, or the

1 recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally
2 authorized within such State to provide a program of educa-
3 tion beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educa-
4 tional program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or
5 provides not less than a two-year program which is accept-
6 able for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or
7 other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a na-
8 tionally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if
9 not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted,
10 on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so
11 accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred
12 from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II,
13 such term includes an institution, not located in any State,
14 which the Commissioner determines to be substantially com-
15 parable to an institution which comes within the preceding
16 provisions of this subsection. For purposes of titles II
17 and III, such term includes any private business school or
18 technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses
19 (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For purposes of this sub-
20 section, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally
21 recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he
22 determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of train-
23 ing offered.

24 (c) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner
25 of Education.

1 (d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of
2 Health, Education, and Welfare.

3 (e) The term "State educational agency" means the
4 State board of education or other agency or officer primarily
5 responsible for the State supervision of elementary and sec-
6 ondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an
7 officer or agency designated by the governor or by State
8 law.

9 (f) The term "school-age population" means that part
10 of the population which is between the ages of five and
11 seventeen, both inclusive, and such school-age population for
12 the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner
13 on the basis of the population between such ages for the
14 most recent year for which satisfactory data are available
15 from the Department of Commerce.

16 (g) The term "resident" when used with respect to any
17 State shall have the meaning established by regulations of
18 the Commissioner and shall include a citizen of the United
19 States who is domiciled in such State but is living outside
20 of any State.

21 (h) The term "elementary school" means a public
22 school which provides elementary education as determined
23 under State law.

24 (i) The term "secondary school" means a public school
25 which provides secondary education, as determined under

1 State law, except that it does not include any education
2 provided beyond grade 12. For the purposes of title IV, the
3 term "secondary school" may include a junior college, as
4 determined under State law.

5 (j) The term "local educational agency" means a
6 board of education or other legally constituted local school
7 authority having administrative control and direction of
8 elementary schools or secondary schools in a city, county,
9 township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

10 (k) The term "nonprofit", as applied to a school or
11 institution, means a school or institution owned and operated
12 by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no
13 part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully
14 inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

15 (l) The term "public" as applied to any school or
16 institution does not include a school or institution of any
17 agency of the United States.

18 TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITU- 19 TIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

20 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

21 SEC. 201. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner
22 to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of
23 higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans
24 to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in
25 such institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropri-

1 ated \$47,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
2 \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960,
3 \$82,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961,
4 \$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962,
5 and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and
6 each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary
7 to enable students who have received a loan for any school
8 year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or complete
9 their education. Sums appropriated under this section for
10 any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agree-
11 ments between the Commissioner and institutions of higher
12 education, for payment of Federal capital contributions
13 which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall
14 be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan
15 funds.

16 ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

17 SEC. 202. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant
18 to section 201 for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1,
19 1962, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount
20 which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated
21 as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in
22 institutions of higher education in such State bears to the
23 total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in
24 institutions of higher education in all of the States. The
25 number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions

1 of higher education for purposes of this section shall be
2 determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year
3 for which satisfactory data are available to him.

4 (b) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any
5 fiscal year ending after June 30, 1962, shall be allotted
6 among the States in such manner as the Commissioner deter-
7 mines to be necessary to carry out the purpose for which
8 such amounts are appropriated.

9 PAYMENT OF FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

10 SEC. 203. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to
11 time set dates by which institutions of higher education in
12 a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions
13 from the allotment of such State. In the event the total re-
14 quested in such applications, which are made by institutions
15 with which he has agreements under this title and which
16 meet the requirements established in regulations of the Com-
17 missioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State
18 available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution
19 from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the
20 same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the
21 amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to
22 the total requested in all such applications. In the event
23 the total requested in such applications which are made by
24 institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allot-

1 ment of such State available for such purpose, the Commis-
2 sioner may realLOT the remaining amount from time to time,
3 on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other
4 States in proportion to the original allotments to such States
5 under section 202 for such year. The Federal capital con-
6 tribution to an institution shall be paid to it from time to
7 time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will
8 not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan
9 fund.

10 (b) In no case may the total of such Federal capital
11 contributions to any institution of higher education for any
12 fiscal year exceed \$250,000.

13 CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENTS

14 SEC. 204. An agreement with any institution of higher
15 education for Federal capital contributions by the Commis-
16 sioner under this title shall—

17 (1) provide for establishment of a student loan
18 fund by such institution;

19 (2) provide for deposit in such fund of (A) the
20 Federal capital contributions, (B) an amount, not less
21 than 25 per centum thereof, contributed by such institu-
22 tion, (C) collections of principal and interest on student
23 loans made from such fund, and (D) any other earnings
24 of the fund;

25 (3) provide that such student loan fund shall be

1 used only for loans to students in accordance with such
2 agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this
3 title, and for costs of litigation arising in connection
4 with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest
5 on such loan; and

6 (4) include such other provisions as may be neces-
7 sary to protect the financial interest of the United States
8 and promote the purposes of this title and as are agreed
9 to by the Commissioner and the institution.

10 TERMS OF LOANS

11 SEC. 205. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year
12 to any student made by institutions of higher education from
13 loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this
14 title may not exceed \$1,000, and the total for all years to
15 any student from such funds may not exceed \$5,000.

16 (b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by
17 any institution of higher education shall be made on such
18 terms and conditions as the institution may determine; sub-
19 ject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and require-
20 ments as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation
21 or in the agreement with the institution) with a view to
22 preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund
23 to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the
24 objective of enabling the student to complete his course of
25 study; and except that—

1 (1) such a loan shall be made only to a student
2 without discrimination based upon race, color, religion,
3 national origin or sex who (A) is in need of the amount
4 of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution,
5 and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution,
6 of maintaining good standing in such course of study and
7 has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student
8 at such institution or, in the case of a student already
9 attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-
10 time attendance there either as an undergraduate or
11 graduate student;

12 (2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or
13 other written agreement which provides for repay-
14 ment of the principal amount in equal annual install-
15 ments over a ten-year period which begins one year
16 after the borrower ceases to be a full-time student at
17 the institution of higher education which made the loan
18 or at any other institution which is participating in the
19 program established under this title (or, if not par-
20 ticipating, has been approved by the Commissioner for
21 the purpose of this paragraph) : *Provided*, That such ten-
22 year period may be extended for good cause deter-
23 mined in accordance with regulations of the Commis-
24 sioner;

25 (3) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid

1 balance of the loan, at the rate of 2 per centum per
2 annum during the period prior to the first year for which
3 repayment of an installment on the principal is due
4 (such interest to be paid annually during such period)
5 and at the rate of 4 per centum per annum after such
6 period: *Provided*, That the borrower may at his option
7 repay all or any part of the loan in advance of the time
8 or times when due, and such repayment shall be made
9 without penalty and without advancing the first year for
10 which interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum, in
11 lieu of 2 per centum per annum, would otherwise be
12 payable under this title;

13 (4) no security or endorsement may be required for
14 any such loan unless the borrower is a minor and the
15 note or other evidence of obligation executed by him
16 would not, under the applicable law, create a binding
17 obligation;

18 (5) the liability to repay any such loan shall be
19 canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he be-
20 comes permanently and totally disabled as determined
21 in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

22 (6) such a loan by an institution for any year shall
23 be made in such installments as may be provided in
24 regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with
25 the institution under this title and, upon notice to the

1 Commissioner by the institution that any recipient of
2 a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any
3 or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld,
4 as may be appropriate; and

5 (7) no note or other evidence of such a loan may
6 be transferred or assigned by the institution of higher
7 education making the loan except, upon the transfer of
8 the borrower to another institution of higher education
9 participating in the program under this title (or, if not
10 participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by
11 the Commissioner for such purpose), to such institution.

12 (c) An agreement under this title for payment of Fed-
13 eral capital contributions to any institution of higher educa-
14 tion shall include provisions designed to make loans from
15 the student loan fund established pursuant to such agree-
16 ment reasonably available (to the extent of the available
17 funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such institution
18 in need thereof.

19 DISTRIBUTIONS OF ASSETS FROM STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

20 SEC. 206. (a) After June 30, 1966, and not later than
21 September 30, 1966, there shall be a capital distribution of
22 the balance of the student loan fund established under this
23 title by each institution of higher education as follows:

24 (1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount
25 which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund

1 at the close of June 30, 1966, as the total amount of the
2 Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Com-
3 missioner under this title bears to the sum of such Fed-
4 eral capital contributions and the institution's capital con-
5 tributions to such fund.

6 (2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid
7 to the institution.

8 (b) After September 30, 1966, each institution with
9 which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this
10 title shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than
11 quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received
12 by the institution after June 30, 1966, in payment of prin-
13 cipal or interest on student loans made from the student
14 loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which
15 amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of
16 litigation incurred in collection thereof and not already re-
17 imbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of
18 principal or interest) as was paid to the Commissioner under
19 subsection (a).

20 (c) Upon a finding by the institution or the Commis-
21 sioner prior to July 1, 1966, that the liquid assets of a student
22 loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this
23 title exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the
24 foreseeable future, and upon notice to such institution and
25 to the Commissioner, there shall be, subject to such limita-

1 tions as may be included in regulations of the Commissioner
2 or in such agreement, a capital distribution from such fund.
3 Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

4 (1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount
5 which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed
6 as the Federal capital contributions by the Commis-
7 sioner to the student loan fund prior to such distribution
8 bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions
9 and the capital contributions to the fund made by the
10 institution.

11 (2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall
12 be paid to the institution.

13 LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS

14 SEC. 207. (a) Upon application by any institution of
15 higher education with which he has made an agreement
16 under this title, the Commissioner may make a loan to such
17 institution for the purpose of helping to finance the institu-
18 tion's capital contributions to a student loan fund established
19 pursuant to such agreement. Any such loan may be made
20 only if such institution shows it is unable to secure such funds
21 from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which
22 the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent
23 with the purposes of this title. Loans made to institutions
24 under this section shall bear interest at a rate which the
25 Commissioner determines to be adequate to cover (1) the

1 cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the
2 Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the
3 current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations
4 of the United States having maturities comparable to the
5 maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this
6 section, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3)
7 probable losses.

8 (b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
9 such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes
10 of this section, but not to exceed a total of \$25,000,000.

11 (c) Loans made by the Commissioner under this section
12 shall mature within such period as may be determined by
13 the Commissioner to be appropriate in each case, but not
14 exceeding fifteen years.

15 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

16 SEC. 208. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the
17 other powers conferred upon him by this title, shall have
18 power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made
19 under this title and to compromise, waive, or release
20 any right, title, claim, or demand, however arising or
21 acquired under this title, except that nothing in this sub-
22 section shall be construed to affect the power of the Attorney
23 General in the conduct of litigation arising under this Act.

24 (b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pur-

1 suant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in con-
2 nection with such financial transactions, shall be final and
3 conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that
4 all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General
5 Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the
6 Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

7 TITLE III—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTH-
8 ENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MOD-
9 ERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN
10 PUBLIC SCHOOLS

11 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

12 SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
13 ated \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
14 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making
15 payments to State educational agencies under this title for
16 the acquisition of equipment (suitable for use in provid-
17 ing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign
18 language) and for minor remodeling which are referred to
19 in paragraph (1) of section 303 (a). There are hereby
20 authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year
21 ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding
22 fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agen-
23 cies under this title to carry out the programs referred to in
24 paragraph (5) of section 303 (a).

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 302. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 401 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 808. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

(A) the school-age population of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)),
bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(2) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the continental United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum or more than $66\frac{2}{3}$ per centum. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1959, on the basis of the average

1 of the incomes per child of school age for the States and
2 for the continental United States for the three most recent
3 consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available
4 from the Department of Commerce. The first such promul-
5 gation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in
6 the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30,
7 1960, and the second shall be conclusive for each of the two
8 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending
9 June 30, 1962.

10 (3) For the purposes of this title—

11 (A) The term “child of school age” means a mem-
12 ber of the population between the ages of five and
13 seventeen, both inclusive.

14 (B) The term “continental United States” does not
15 include Alaska.

16 (C) The term “income per child of school age” for
17 any State or for the continental United States means the
18 total personal income for the State and the continental
19 United States, respectively, divided by the number of
20 children of school age in such State and in the conti-
21 nental United States, respectively.

22 (4) A State’s allotment under this subsection shall re-
23 main available for payment pursuant to section 304 (a) for
24 projects in such State until the end of the fiscal year following
25 the year for which the allotment is made.

1 (b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the sec-
2 ond sentence of section 301 for any fiscal year the Com-
3 missioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2
4 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as
5 provided in section 808. From the remainder of such sums
6 the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which
7 bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the
8 school-age population of such State bears to the total of the
9 school-age populations of all of the States. The amount
10 allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any
11 fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to
12 \$20,000, the total thereby required being derived by propor-
13 tionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remain-
14 ing States under the preceding sentence, but with such ad-
15 justments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of
16 any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced
17 to less than \$20,000.

18 STATE PLANS

19 SEC. 303. (a) Any State which desires to receive pay-
20 ments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner,
21 through its State educational agency, a State plan which—
22 (1) sets forth a program under which funds paid
23 to the State from its allotment under section 302 (a)
24 will be expended solely for projects approved by the
25 State educational agency for (A) acquisition of labora-

1 tory and other special equipment, including audio-visual
2 materials and equipment and printed materials (other
3 than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education
4 in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language,
5 for use in elementary or secondary schools, or both, and
6 (B) minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used
7 for such materials or equipment;

8 (2) sets forth principles for determining the prior-
9 ity of such projects in the State for assistance under
10 this title and provides for undertaking such projects,
11 insofar as financial resources available therefor make
12 possible, in the order determined by the application of
13 such principles;

14 (3) provides an opportunity for a hearing before the
15 State educational agency to interested persons with
16 respect to each application for the approval of such a
17 project under this title;

18 (4) provides for the establishment of standards on
19 a State level for laboratory and other special equipment
20 acquired with assistance furnished under this title;

21 (5) sets forth a program under which funds paid to
22 the State from its allotment under section 302 (b) will
23 be expended solely for (A) expansion or improvement
24 of supervisory or related services in the fields of

1 science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and

2 (B) administration of the State plan;

3 (6) provides that the State educational agency will
4 be the sole agency for administering the plan;

5 (7) provides that the State educational agency will
6 make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and
7 containing such information, as may be reasonably nec-
8 essary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties
9 under this title; and

10 (8) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
11 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure prop-
12 er disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid
13 to the State under this title.

14 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
15 and any modification thereof which complies with the pro-
16 visions of subsection (a).

17 PAYMENTS TO STATES

18 SEC. 304. (a) From a State's allotment for a fiscal year
19 under section 302 (a), the Commissioner shall, from time to
20 time during the period such allotment is available for pay-
21 ment as provided in paragraph (4) of section 302 (a), pay
22 to such State an amount equal to one-half of the expendi-
23 tures for projects for acquisition of equipment and minor re-
24 modeling referred to in paragraph (1) of section 303 (a)

1 which are carried out under its State plan approved under
2 section 303 (b) ; except that no State shall receive payments
3 under this subsection for any period in excess of its allotments
4 for such period under section 302 (a) .

5 (b) From a State's allotment under section 302 (b) for
6 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner shall
7 from time to time pay to such State an amount equal to the
8 amount expended by such State for such year to carry out
9 the program referred to in paragraph (5) of section 303 (a)
10 under its State plan approved under section 303 (b) . From
11 a State's allotment under section 302 (b) for the fiscal year
12 ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding
13 fiscal years, such payment shall equal 50 per centum of the
14 amount so expended under its State plan approved under
15 section 303 (b) ; except that no State shall receive payments
16 under this subsection for any fiscal year in excess of its allot-
17 ment under section 302 (b) for that fiscal year.

18 TITLE IV—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

19 LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

20 SEC. 401. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to
21 arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher edu-
22 cation, for the operation by them, during the period begin-
23 ning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30,
24 1962, of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced
25 training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods

1 and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged
2 in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising
3 or training teachers of any modern foreign language in
4 schools at the elementary or secondary level or in institu-
5 tions of higher education.

6 (b) A contract pursuant to this section may cover
7 all or any part of the cost of the institute with respect
8 to which it is made, and may be made on such conditions
9 as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the pur-
10 poses of this section.

11 (c) The Commissioner is also authorized during the pe-
12 riod beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of
13 June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals attending any
14 institute established under this section, including allowances
15 for dependents and for travel to and from their places of
16 residence.

17 LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS

18 SEC. 402. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to ar-
19 range through contracts with institutions of higher education
20 for the establishment and operation by them, during the
21 period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of
22 June 30, 1962, of centers for the teaching of any modern
23 foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner
24 determines (1) that individuals trained in such language are
25 needed by the Federal Government or by business, industry,

1 or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate
2 instruction in such language is not readily available in the
3 United States. Any such contract may provide for instruc-
4 tion not only in such modern foreign language but also in
5 other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the
6 areas, regions, or countries in which such language is com-
7 monly used, to the extent adequate instruction in such fields
8 is not readily available, including fields such as history, po-
9 litical science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography,
10 and anthropology. Any such contract may cover not more
11 than 50 per centum of the cost of the establishment and
12 operation of the center with respect to which it is made,
13 including the cost of grants to the staff for travel in the for-
14 eign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject mat-
15 ter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working
16 is concerned and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to such
17 centers to teach or assist in teaching therein and the cost of
18 their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the
19 Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of
20 this section.

21 (b) The Commissioner is also authorized, during the
22 period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close
23 of June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals undergoing
24 advanced training in any modern foreign language (with
25 respect to which he makes the determination under clause

1 (1) of subsection (a)), and other fields needed for a full
2 understanding of the area, region, or country in which such
3 language is commonly used, at any short-term or regular ses-
4 sion of any institution of higher education, including allow-
5 ances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of
6 residence, but only upon reasonable assurance that the re-
7 cipients of such stipends will, on completion of their training,
8 be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an
9 institution of higher education or for such other service
10 of a public nature as may be permitted in regulations of the
11 Commissioner.

12 RESEARCH AND STUDIES

13 SEC. 403. The Commissioner is authorized, directly or
14 by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the
15 need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign
16 languages and other fields needed to provide a full under-
17 standing of the areas, regions, or countries in which such
18 languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more
19 effective methods of teaching such languages and in such
20 other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in
21 such training, or in training teachers of such languages or
22 in such fields.

23 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

24 SEC. 404. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
25 priated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the

1 provisions of this title, not to exceed \$4,500,000 in any one
2 fiscal year.

3 TITLE V—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE
4 EDUCATION

5 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

6 SEC. 501. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
7 ated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the pro-
8 visions of this title.

9 NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS

10 SEC. 502. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
11 the Commissioner is authorized to award one thousand fel-
12 lowships under the provisions of this title, and during each
13 of the three succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award
14 one thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellow-
15 ships shall be for periods of study not in excess of three aca-
16 demic years.

17 AWARD OF FELLOWSHIPS AND APPROVAL OF INSTITUTIONS

18 SEC. 503. (a) The Commissioner shall award fellow-
19 ships under this title to individuals without discrimination
20 based upon race, color, religion, national origin or sex
21 accepted for study in graduate programs approved by him
22 under this section. The Commissioner shall approve a
23 graduate program of an institution of higher education only

1 upon application by the institution and only upon his finding
2 that:

3 (1) such program is a new program or an existing
4 program which has been expanded,

5 (2) such new program or expansion of an existing
6 program will substantially further the objective of in-
7 creasing the facilities available in the Nation for the
8 graduate training of college or university level teachers
9 and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of
10 such facilities throughout the Nation, and

11 (3) in the acceptance of persons for study in such
12 programs preference will be given to persons interested
13 in teaching in institutions of higher education.

14 (b) The total of the fellowships awarded under this
15 title for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program
16 at any institution of higher education may not exceed
17 a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the
18 objective referred to in subsection (a) (2).

19 FELLOWSHIP STIPENDS

20 SEC. 504. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under
21 the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of \$2,000
22 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate
23 degree, \$2,200 for the second such year, and \$2,400 for

1 the third such year, plus an additional amount of \$400 for
2 each such year on account of each of his dependents.

3 (b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant
4 to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of
5 higher education at which each such person is pursuing
6 his course of study such amount, not less than \$500 or more
7 than \$2,500 per academic year, as is determined by the
8 Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the
9 new graduate program or of the expansion in an existing
10 graduate program which he is pursuing, which is reasonably
11 attributable to such person.

12 FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

13 SEC. 505. A person awarded a fellowship under the
14 provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments
15 provided in section 504 (a) only during such periods as
16 the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory
17 proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study
18 or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded,
19 in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in
20 gainful employment other than part-time employment by
21 such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities
22 approved by the Commissioner.

1 TITLE VI—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING;
2 IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT
3 OF ABLE STUDENTS

4 PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

5 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

6 SEC. 601. There are hereby authorized to be appropri-
7 ated \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,
8 and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making
9 grants to State educational agencies under this part to assist
10 them to establish and maintain programs of testing and
11 guidance and counseling.

12 ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

13 SEC. 602. From the sums appropriated pursuant to sec-
14 tion 601 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve
15 such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as
16 he may determine for allotment as provided in section 808.
17 From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall
18 allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to
19 the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of
20 such State bears to the total of school-age populations of all
21 of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the
22 preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than

1 \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total of increases
2 thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing
3 the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under
4 the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may
5 be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining
6 States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

7 STATE PLANS

8 SEC. 603. (a) Any State which desires to receive pay-
9 ments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner,
10 through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

11 (1) sets forth (A) a program under which funds
12 paid to the State under this part will be expended by
13 the State educational agency, or granted by it to local
14 educational agencies in the State for expenditure, to
15 establish or maintain programs of testing and guidance
16 and counseling which will operate in the secondary
17 schools of such State and be directed at (i) identifying
18 students with outstanding aptitude and ability in such
19 schools, (ii) advising students of courses of study best
20 suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (iii)
21 encouraging students with outstanding aptitude and
22 ability to complete their secondary school education,
23 take the necessary courses for admission to institutions
24 of higher education, and enter such institutions after
25 completion of their secondary school education; and

1 (B) the means of testing which will be utilized in carry-
2 ing out such programs;

3 (2) sets forth the purposes for, and the conditions
4 under, which funds paid to a State under this part will
5 be granted to local educational agencies in such State;

6 (3) provides that the State educational agency
7 will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

8 (4) provides that the State educational agency
9 will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such
10 form and containing such information as may be reason-
11 ably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform
12 his duties under this part; and

13 (5) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
14 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper
15 disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid
16 to the State under this part.

17 (b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan
18 and any modification thereof which complies with the pro-
19 visions of subsection (a).

20 PAYMENTS TO STATES

21 SEC. 604. Payment under this part shall be made to
22 those State educational agencies which administer plans
23 approved under section 603. For the fiscal year ending
24 June 30, 1959, such payments shall equal the amount ex-

1 pended by the State in carrying out its State plan, and for
2 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the
3 two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal 50
4 per centum of the amount so expended; except that no State
5 educational agency shall receive payment under this part
6 for any fiscal year in excess of that State's allotment for
7 that fiscal year as determined under section 602.

8 PART B—INSTITUTES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

9 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

10 SEC. 621. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
11 priated \$6,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30,
12 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for
13 the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this part.

14 PURPOSE

15 SEC. 622. The Commissioner shall (1) arrange through
16 contracts with institutions of higher education for the estab-
17 lishment and operation by them of summer or regular session
18 institutes consisting of courses in the counseling and guidance
19 of students at the secondary school level with emphasis upon
20 the counseling and guidance of gifted students, and (2) pay
21 stipends under the provisions of this part to eligible persons
22 who attend such institutes.

CONTRACT AUTHORITY

SEC. 623. A contract with an institution of higher education under the provisions of this part shall provide for the payment to such institution of the reasonable cost incurred by it in providing the summer or regular session institute contracted for.

STIPENDS

SEC. 624. Any person employed in a public-school system who is employed or is to be employed in a guidance and counseling capacity on a full- or part-time basis and who enrolls in and attends a summer or regular session institute contracted for under this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute. Each such person with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance. However, no person shall receive a stipend under this title at a rate in excess of his last rate of salary for the immediately preceding academic year. Stipends under this section shall be paid only for periods during which the recipient is in attendance

1 in good standing at the institute as determined by the
2 Commissioner in accordance with its regularly prescribed
3 standards and practices.

4 TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTA-
5 TION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF
6 TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND
7 RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PUR-
8 POSES

9 APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED; FUNCTIONS OF
10 COMMISSIONER

11 SEC. 701. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
12 \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and
13 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the
14 Commissioner, through grants or contracts, to—

15 (1) make studies and surveys to determine the
16 need for increased or improved utilization of television,
17 radio, motion pictures, and related media of communica-
18 tion by State or local educational agencies and institu-
19 tions of higher education in providing education;

20 (2) conduct research, demonstrations, and experi-
21 ments in the use of such media for such purposes;

22 (3) conduct research, demonstrations, and experi-
23 ments in the development and use of new media of
24 communication (and other audio-visual aids) for such
25 purposes;

(4) evaluate and publish reports concerning the effectiveness of such media for such purposes; and

(5) prepare and publish abstracts and catalogs of audio-visual materials available for such purposes to the extent such abstracts or catalogs are not otherwise readily available; and

to enable him to provide, upon request, advice, counsel, and technical assistance to State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize such media of communication in providing education.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 801. (a) In administering this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U. S. C., sec. 5), of any other public or non-profit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

(b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report a full report of the activities under this Act, including recommendations for needed revisions in its provisions.

(c) The Secretary shall advise and consult with the heads of executive departments and independent establishments of the Federal Government responsible for the admin-

1 istration of scholarship, fellowship, or other educational
2 programs, with a view to the full coordination of all
3 specialized scholarship, fellowship, and other educational
4 programs administered by or under all departments and
5 establishments of the Federal Government with the programs
6 established by this Act.

7 IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES OF STATE
8 EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

9 SEC. 802. (a) For the purpose of assisting the States
10 to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of
11 educational statistics provided by State and local reports and
12 records and the methods and techniques for collecting and
13 processing educational data and disseminating information
14 about the condition and progress of education in the States,
15 there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal
16 year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding
17 fiscal years, for grants to States under this section, such sums
18 as the Congress may determine.

(b) Grants under this section by the Commissioner shall be equal to one-half of the cost of State educational agency programs to carry out the purposes of this section, including (1) improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of statistical data supplied by local educational units, (2) the development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve as guides for local educational units, (3) the conduct of con-

1 ferences and training for personnel of local educational units
2 and of periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for
3 records and reports, (4) improving methods for obtaining,
4 from other State agencies within the State, educational data
5 not collected by the State educational agency, or (5) ex-
6 pediting the processing and reporting of statistical data
7 through installation and operation of mechanical equipment.
8 The total of the payments to any State under this section
9 for any fiscal year may not exceed \$50,000.

10 (c) Payments with respect to any program of a State
11 educational agency under this section may be made (1) only
12 to the extent it is a new program or an addition to or expan-
13 sion of an existing program, and (2) only if the State plan
14 approved under subsection (d) includes such program.

15 (d) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for
16 purposes of this section if such plan—

17 (1) provides that the State educational agency shall
18 be the sole agency for carrying out programs under
19 the plan either directly or through arrangements with
20 other agencies of the State;

21 (2) sets forth the program proposed to be carried
22 out under the plan and the general policies to be followed
23 in doing so;

24 (3) provides for such fiscal control and fund ac-
25 counting procedures as may be necessary to assure

1 proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds
2 paid to the State under this section; and

3 (4) provides for the making of such reports to the
4 Commissioner in such form and containing such informa-
5 tion as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commis-
6 sioner to perform his duties under this section.

7 DISAPPROVAL OF, AND FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH,
8 STATE PLANS

9 SEC. 803. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally dis-
10 approve any State plan submitted under this Act, or any
11 modification thereof, without first affording the agency ad-
12 ministering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a
13 hearing.

14 (b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable
15 notice and opportunity for hearing to the agency administer-
16 ing a State plan approved under one of the titles of this
17 Act, finds that—

18 (1) the State plan has been so changed that it no
19 longer complies with the provisions of this Act govern-
20 ing its original approval, or

21 (2) in the administration of the plan there is a
22 failure to comply substantially with any such provision,
23 the Commissioner shall suspend approval of the State
24 plan, and shall notify the agency administering the plan
25 of the suspension. When approval of a State plan has been

1 suspended by the Commissioner such approval shall remain
2 suspended until he is satisfied that there is no longer any
3 such failure to comply.

4 (c) (1) While approval of a State plan submitted
5 under title II is suspended by the Commissioner he shall
6 not award new scholarships to individuals certified to him
7 by the State Commission (or the Commissioner, in his dis-
8 cretion, may provide that the State Commission will not be
9 eligible to participate in the part of a program under the
10 title, or in the part of the State plan, which is affected by
11 the failure to comply).

12 (2) While approval of a State plan submitted under
13 title IV, part A of title VII, or section 802 is suspended by
14 the Commissioner he shall make no further payments under
15 that title, part, or section (as the case may be) for programs
16 in the State.

17 JUDICIAL REVIEW

18 SEC. 804. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the
19 Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval
20 of a State plan submitted under this Act, or with re-
21 spect to his final action under section 803 (b), such State
22 may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file in
23 the United States district court for the district in which
24 the capital of the State is located, a petition to review such
25 action. The petition for review shall (1) contain a concise

1 statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based and
2 (2) designate that part of the Commissioner's decision
3 sought to be reviewed.

4 (b) Notification of the filing of the petition for review
5 shall be given by the clerk of the court by mailing a copy of
6 the petition to the Commissioner.

7 (c) No costs or docket fees shall be charged or imposed
8 with respect to any judicial review proceedings, or appeal
9 therefrom, taken under this Act.

10 (d) Upon receipt of the petition for review the Commis-
11 sioner shall, within twenty days thereafter, certify and file
12 in the court the record on review, consisting of the complete
13 transcript of the proceedings before the Commissioner. No
14 party to such review shall be required, by rule of court or
15 otherwise, to print the contents of such record filed in the
16 court.

17 (e) The court after review may dismiss the petition or
18 deny the relief prayed for, or may suspend, modify, or set
19 aside, in whole or in part, the action of the Commissioner,
20 or may compel action unlawfully withheld. The judgment
21 of the court shall be subject to review as provided in section
22 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

23 **METHOD OF PAYMENT**

24 **SEC. 805.** Payments under this Act to any individual
25 or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher

1 education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant
2 or contract, may be made in installments, and in
3 advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of
4 grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpay-
5 ments or underpayments.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

7 SEC. 806. There are hereby authorized to be appro-
8 priated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for
9 each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary
10 for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

11 ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS AND BEQUESTS

12 SEC. 807. The Commissioner is authorized to accept
13 gifts, grants, bequests, or devises for carrying out the pro-
14 visions of this Act.

15 ALLOTMENTS TO TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

16 SEC. 808. The amounts reserved by the Commissioner
17 under sections 302 and 602 shall be allotted by the
18 Commissioner among Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal
19 Zone, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, according to their
20 respective needs for the type of assistance furnished under
21 the part or title in which the section appears.

22 ADVISORY COMMITTEES

23 SEC. 809. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval
24 of the Secretary, may appoint an advisory committee, or
25 advisory committees, to advise and consult with him with

1 respect to the administration of titles IV, V, and VII
2 of this Act. Members of an advisory committee ap-
3 pointed under this section, while attending conferences or
4 meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive com-
5 pensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not
6 exceeding \$50 per diem, and while away from their homes
7 or regular places of business they may be allowed travel
8 expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as au-
9 thorized by law for persons in the Government service
10 employed intermittently.

11 (b) Any member of an advisory committee appointed
12 under this section is hereby exempted, with respect to such
13 appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284,
14 and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section
15 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U. S. C.,
16 sec. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (c)
17 of this section.

18 (c) The exemption granted by subsection (b) shall not
19 extend—

20 (1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connec-
21 tion with the appointee's Government service from any
22 source other than the private employer of the appointee
23 at the time of his appointment, or

24 (2) during the period of such appointment, and
25 the further period of two years after the termination

1 thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prose-
2 cution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against
3 the Government involving any matter concerning which
4 the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his
5 appointment during the period of such appointment.

Passed the House of Representatives August 8, 1958.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

AUGUST 11, 1958

Received; read twice and ordered to be placed on the
calendar

100-10000 H. R. 13267

AM ACT

TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF THE
INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES
AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF THE
INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES
AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF THE
INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

SECTION 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

27. PUBLIC LAW 480. Rep. Quie inserted an editorial criticizing the delay in the reenactment of legislation to extend Public Law 480. p. A7240
28. EDUCATION. Speech in the House by Rep. Osmer favoring the proposed National Defense Education Act of 1958. pp. A7240-1
29. COUNTRY LIFE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Quie stating that "I regard it as unfortunate that this Congress has not taken steps to establish a Commission on Country Life," and that it should be one of the first orders of business for the next Congress. pp. A7242-3

BILLS INTRODUCED

30. MARKETING. S. 4277, by Sen. Proxmire, to extend authority for marketing agreements and marketing orders to producers of fresh fruits and vegetables for canning and freezing; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 15822-3
31. HEALTH; RESEARCH. S. J. Res. 199, by Sen. Hill, to establish in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare the National Advisory Council for International Medical Research; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 15823-5
32. COTTON. S. J. Res. 200, by Sen. Symington, to stay temporarily certain reductions in cotton and rice acreage allotments; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. p. 15858
33. RESEARCH. S. Con. Res. 117, by Sen. Flanders (by request), providing a "Complementary Training Program for Scientists and Engineers"; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee.
34. RECLAMATION. H. R. 13759, by Rep. Saylor, to restate and amplify the provisions of the Federal Reclamation laws respecting delivery of water to large land holdings; to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
35. ETHICS. H. J. Res. 694, by Rep. Bennett, Fla., to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government to interpret the application of the Code of Ethics for Government Service; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

36. INFORMATION. H. R. 2767, to amend 5 U. S. C. 22, which authorizes heads of departments to prescribe regulations for the custody, use, and preservation of records, papers, and property, so as to provide that this section of the Code does not authorize withholding information from the public or limiting the availability of records to the public. Approved August 12, 1958 (Public Law 85-619, 85th Congress).

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENT:

Aug. 14: Make acquired forest lands subject to Weeks Act, and transfer of forest land to Sumpter County, Fla., H. Agriculture (exec).

16. EDUCATION. Passed, 62 to 26, with amendments H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill, after substituting the text of S. 4237, a similar bill. S. 4237 was indefinitely postponed. pp. 15831-41, 15846-54, 15860-1, 15865-73, 15876-906, 15909-33.

Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Dush to limit the authorization for the area vocational education program to 4 years, and to restrict the programs to training designed to teach individuals skills useful in occupations needed for national defense. p. 15922

17. SALINE WATER. Conferees were appointed on S. J. Res. 135, to authorize the Interior Department to construct and operate demonstration plants for the production of water for consumptive uses from saline or brackish water. House conferees have not been appointed. pp. 15859-60

18. FORESTRY. Sen. Morse criticized the Administration's policies on timber access road construction, accusing them of lack of foresight, antagonism to smaller timber operators, and unequal treatment for the Pacific Northwest. He inserted copies of correspondence with the Secretary, Mr. Peterson, and Mr. McLain, including statistics on the program. pp. 15939-42

19. APPROPRIATION. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 13450, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1959 (S. Rept. 2350). p. 15821

The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 13489, the military construction appropriation bill for 1959 (S. Rept. 2362). p. 15821

20. SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Mansfield inserted a speech by Sen. Fulbright commending passage of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. pp. 15875-6

21. WATER RESOURCES. Sens. Murray and Neuberger commented on Russian water power and river development and urged that U. S. developments be speeded up. p. 15829

Sen. Johnson stated that Tex. needed a water resource development program. p. 15820

22. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that he doubted Congress would adjourn this week, and that he believed it more important to pass important legislation than to meet any deadline for adjournment. (pp. 15820-1). He stated that on Thurs., Aug. 14, the Senate would consider H. R. 13450, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1959 (p. 15933). By unanimous consent it was agreed to call the calendar Thurs., Aug. 14. p. 15820

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

23. WATER RESOURCES. Rep. Simpson inserted a report of the Nat'l Projects Committee which was adopted by the Nat'l Rivers and Harbors Conference. pp. A7217-9

24. INVESTIGATIONS. Rep. Ayres stated that he was "amazed" to learn that there are 40,000 full-time investigators on the Federal payroll, inserted two editorials on this subject, one of which stated that this Department has a total of 5,932. pp. A7228-9

25. AREA DEVELOPMENT. Rep. Avery criticized the Senate's action in cutting the budget for the Office of Area Development in the Department of Commerce. p. A7229

26. INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dixon urging increased utilization research and inserting an article, "Utilization Research Has Benefited Agriculture." p. A7232

and it goes to the very heart of our problem with the Communist head of the Yugoslavian Government.

I believe that this is a clear-cut interpretation of Tito's methods, and I commend it to the reading of the Members of Congress and the public in general.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article made a part of my remarks and printed as such in the body of the RECORD. In addition, I refer to an editorial which appeared in the same newspaper and published on the same date, entitled "We're Our Own Worst Enemy." This editorial also relates to Communist Yugoslavia, and I ask unanimous consent that it also be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union Leader of Monday, August 11, 1958]

TITO—THE SWINDLER
(By Victor Riesel)

MUNICH.—Evidence of a multi-billion-dollar scandal has just been reported to a trusted few here by a special observer who has been in Tito's Yugoslavia for exactly 1 year.

Ever since Stalin's death, it can now be revealed, Nikita Khrushchev and Marshal Tito have been plotting to defraud the United States of billions of dollars. Until recently, they were intimate personal friends chuckling at the ease with which they have sucked billions of dollars from us.

It is now absolutely certain that they even planned the crushing of the Hungarian anti-Communists long before the ghastly Budapest revolt. Evidence brought into the little briefing room of the crusading Radio Free Europe headquarters here by an objective observer with whom I lunched exactly a year ago on his departure for Belgrade reveals that Marshal Tito disdained the West and approved of the use of Soviet Army tanks and troops in splattering the Hungarian freedom fighters on that grim night in October 1956.

Mark this well, for Tito has our gold and Hungary's blood on his hands—and this gold could have propped up our own Army and our own recession economy.

Tens of thousands of jobs in the United States could have been saved if the gold had gone for paving our roads, building schools and low-cost homes, or simply for military purchases and aid to truly friendly nations.

Evidence that Marshal Tito was certainly not one of our allies or even really neutral begins with his flying visit to Khrushchev in Yalta not long after Stalin's death. There Khrushchev told Tito that the Russians could crush the wayward satellites with tanks, but that they didn't want to be barefisted Fascists before the world. Therefore, Tito, as the so-called rebel highly respected by the dissidents—revisionists, Khrushchev called them—could soothe them into line.

Comrade Khrushchev was particularly concerned over the growing unrest in Hungary. Tito was eager to get back into the green pastures of Moscow's Communist Mecca. So he agreed to try.

This failed. The Budapest revolt, led by Hungarian steelworkers and students, flared against Moscow like some political magnesium. On the night before Khrushchev decided to move in his troops and slaughter women, kids, and men alike, he and his silent colleague, Anastas Mikoyan, secretly contacted Tito.

They asked the Yugoslav's reaction if they shot the workers down in the name of his-

torical necessity. Tito approved. The workers were splattered in Budapest.

There was only one humane act by the fearful marshal.

He did tip rebel Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy that something was about to happen and that Nagy should take refuge in the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest.

But on the same morning that Budapest's streets were washed with workers' blood, the central committee of the Yugoslav Community Party issued leaflets in Belgrade saying that the Soviet crushing of the Hungarian uprising was correct in the perspective of history. This leaflet is in the possession of the man who briefed the truly brilliant analyst of Radio Free Europe here.

I was in on this briefing. Add to it one more ghastly Russian move. They had a radio station behind the Khrushchev curtain which broadcast messages to the Hungarians imitating anti-Communist broadcasts, urging the rebels throughout Hungary to continue fighting. Thus Khrushchev provoked more people into the streets and fields and they, too, were slaughtered or captured. Up to this very minute, the survivors are being executed or shipped to prison camps.

That's second act curtain. The third act began recently when Khrushchev decided the time had come when he didn't care what the world thought. Thus he no longer had any use for Tito. Comrade Khrushchev then demanded complete surrender from the elderly marshal. Tito's own Communist Party central committee balked. They felt they had been taken. Inside Yugoslavia now, Tito's control of his own party has been shaken.

He is taking guff from a bloc made up of workers' leaders, military men, youth group officials and anti-Communists such as these in the central committee who still are behind the imprisoned Milovan Djilas. This bloc feels that Tito alienated the United States in the past year by playing with Khrushchev, thus costing Yugoslavia considerable arms and money.

This bloc wants to woo the United States. In retaliation, Tito is trying to drive Djilas to suicide in prison. Tito feels that Djilas who is being deprived of many routine privileges in his horror jail, is the symbol of opposition.

Seems to me a world grand jury should be impaneled to try Tito, the swindler, in a global court of public opinion.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of August 11, 1958]

WE'RE OUR OWN WORST ENEMY

Senator STYLES BRIDGES' one-man campaign to have the Senate Appropriations Committee cut out aid for Communist Yugoslavia and Poland, although unsuccessful, brings nought but credit on himself.

It is indeed one of the great tragedies of our times that only a handful of Congressmen are intelligent enough to see the folly of aiding Communist dictatorships that will turn against us like vicious dogs the moment the shooting begins.

It is obvious that the No. 1 weapon in the Communist arsenal is not the ICBM, nor the hydrogen bomb, nor even subversion and espionage.

It's our own stupidity.

DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACT OF 1958

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 4237.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237) to strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of

peace, and assure the intellectual eminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines, and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof; to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness; to inform our scientists promptly and effectively of the results of research and study carried on in the United States and throughout the world; and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate consideration of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 comes at a time of great decision. A severe blow—some would say a disastrous blow—has been struck at America's self-confidence and at her prestige in the world. Rarely have Americans questioned one another so intensely about our military position, our scientific stature, or our educational system.

The Soviet Union, which only 40 years ago was a nation of peasants today is challenging our America, the world's greatest industrial power, in the very field where we have claimed supremacy: the application of science to technology.

Americans are united in our determination to meet this challenge. Americans know that we must give vastly greater support, emphasis, and dedication to basic scientific research, to quality in education, to instruction in the physical sciences, to training in foreign languages, and to developing to the full our intellectual, cultural, and scientific resources. Americans know we must mobilize our Nation's brainpower in the struggle for survival.

This is a task for all our people, for both great political parties, for both the executive and the legislative branches of our Government, for the States, the counties, the cities and towns and local communities, for the schools, the colleges, and universities, and for all the other private and public resources that constitute the basis of our scientific and educational endeavors.

The particular task of the Senate is to consider how best to stimulate and strengthen science and education for the defense of our country and at the same time preserve the traditional principle, in which we all believe, that primary responsibility and control of education belongs and must remain with the States, local communities, and private institutions.

The United States truly has reached a historic turning point, and the path we choose to pursue may well determine the future not only of western civilization but freedom and peace for all peoples of the earth.

I believe we all agree that the great motivation for the formation of our Federal Government was the responsibility for what the Founding Fathers called the common defense and for the

conduct of our foreign affairs. From the very beginning this responsibility of the Federal Government has been immediate and direct. The Constitution solemnly placed upon the Federal Government this responsibility for the national defense, as we call it today, and for the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Mr. President, speaking on the floor of the Senate some 10 years ago, I said that America's first line of defense is the science laboratory. At the same time, in the same speech on the Senate floor, I declared that foreign affairs are no longer foreign.

If that statement was true 10 years ago, it is true now. There can be no question as to its truth and validity. Surely, America's first line of defense today is in the science laboratory, and foreign affairs are no longer foreign.

We had before our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare many witnesses, including distinguished scientists, distinguished educators, and distinguished leaders in American public life. All those witnesses, without exception, took cognizance of the vital relationship between a good educational system and national survival. Witness after witness testified to the fact that the highest grade of public education, especially in the sciences, mathematics, engineering, and modern foreign languages, is absolutely essential to an adequate national defense. Our first witness, Dr. Detlev A. Bronk, former president of Johns Hopkins University and now president of the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research and president of the National Academy of Sciences, stated:

We cannot compete with Russia and China and other potential enemies in terms of numbers of men and women. Because of that, it is especially important that we have a very high level of education in our country in order to compete against greater numbers with men and women of greater competence. Only this way can we defend our national strength and be effective champions and defenders of the human freedoms on which the whole free world depends.

Then Dr. Bronk laid great emphasis on the fact that we must, within the next 10 or 15 years, double the number of scientists and engineers we are graduating from our schools and colleges.

Dr. Edward Teller, commonly known as the father of the hydrogen bomb, in speaking of the situation in the world, and speaking particularly with reference to science education, declared:

The tide is clearly and definitely running against us.

Then Dr. Teller emphasized that we must train more scientists, more mathematicians, more engineers, more persons versed in foreign languages, if we are to turn the present tide and properly defend our country and its freedom. Dr. Teller said, among many other things, and I think this is important:

I am quite sure that in science more than in other fields the young generation is the one which carries the greatest burden, and therefore the children who are now in school will be the ones on whom we will have to depend primarily 10 years from today.

The chairman then asked Dr. Teller:

We should now, at this time, do all we can to encourage and help them to move forward and develop as much as possible. Is that not true?

Dr. Teller's answer was:

That is what we have to do or I think our way of life will not survive.

There also appeared as a witness Dr. Wernher von Braun, who made the greatest contribution to the design and development of our satellite Explorer, which, as will be recalled, was our first satellite to be successfully put into outer space. When this distinguished scientist, a man of great vision and knowledge, as demonstrated by the work he did in the development of the Explorer, was before the committee, I, as chairman of the committee, asked him if he thought it important that we go forward with greater emphasis on the training and preparation of scientists, engineers, and technicians, so that we might move more rapidly into the space age. Dr. von Braun's answer was:

Yes, sir; I think it is a matter of national survival.

The Chairman of the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers, in transmitting the Committee's second interim report to the President, recently summarized our situation in these words:

Today, Russia has more scientists, engineers, and technicians than the United States, and is graduating more than twice as many each year. Competent American observers report that in certain fields Russian scientific work is comparable in quality to that done here. Certainly the manpower and effort devoted to research and to the education of future scientists exceeds our own.

Mr. President, listen to this statement, which is in the Committee report:

The rate of Russian progress in most scientific fields is so rapid that, unless we broaden and strengthen our own efforts, there is little question of Soviet superiority 5 or 10 years from now.

We recall President Eisenhower's speech in Oklahoma City last November, in which he said, in speaking of the necessity of training, educating, and producing more scientists, engineers, and technicians:

According to my scientific advisers this is for the American people the most critical problem of all.

My scientific advisers place this problem above all other immediate tasks of producing missiles, or developing new techniques in the armed services. We need scientists in the 10 years ahead. They say we need them by thousands more than we are now presently planning to have.

The Federal Government can deal with only part of this difficulty, but it must and will do its part * * *.

We should, among other things, have * * * a system of incentives for high-aptitude students to pursue scientific or professional studies; a program to stimulate good-quality teaching of mathematics and science; provision of more laboratory facilities; and measures, including fellowships, to increase the output of qualified teachers.

Mr. President, I could stand on the floor for many hours quoting the leaders

of thought and the leaders of action in science and education in this country. All of them would tell us the same story.

The distinguished Senator from Texas, our majority leader, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness of the Committee on Armed Services, and who is also Chairman of the Committee on Space, heard many witnesses. If Senators will read the hearings before his subcommittee, they will find that witness after witness testified and emphasized that the need for more scientists, engineers, and technicians must be met if we are to meet the challenge, if our Nation is to be defended, and if we are to survive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I deeply appreciate the generous reference to me by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who is chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. No Member of Congress has, over a long period of years, made a greater contribution to his country than has the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I am very much pleased and am very proud that under his leadership there has been reported a bill which I think meets the minimum requirements. I hope it will be debated and that the Senate can act upon it and pass it before we recess today.

I hope this bill is only the forerunner of better things to come. After Sputnik I, a committee of this body sat for more than 4 months and heard from some of the great statesmen of our time and some of the most learned scholars of our Nation. I came away from those 4 months of deliberations with one firm conclusion, namely, that we must take advantage of time, money, energy, imagination, and everything else available to us and devote them to our educational system if the Republic is to be preserved.

I think history may well record that we saved liberty and saved freedom when we undertook a crash program in the field of education. We have not gone far enough, fast enough. I do not think the people of the Nation realize the competitive struggle which exists. There must be an awakening, not only in Congress, but throughout the country, and first things must come first.

I know of nothing which has higher priority than the education of our children and their preparation for the needs of the modern world. I know of no one who has contributed more or to whom we can look for better leadership than the solid, constructive, progressive Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I commend him for the great work he has done for so many years in Congress.

Mr. HILL. I thank my distinguished friend from Texas. I not only appreciate his kind and most generous words because they come from him, but also because there is no man in America who has done more to try to strengthen education, to strengthen the national defense and to insure the survival of our Nation than has the distinguished Senator from Texas. Considering the many

onerous and overwhelming duties which are upon him, and the burden which he carries, it really has been astounding that he has been able to give so much of his time, thought, effort, and brilliant leadership to the cause of trying to make certain that we meet the challenge, that we move forward as we should, for the defense and, indeed, the survival of our Nation.

I may say one other word in connection with what the distinguished Senator has said, because certainly he speaks with great authority.

As he spoke, there came to me the lines of that wise man of another day, Sir Francis Bacon, who declared:

What man will not alter for the better, time, the great innovator, will alter for the worse.

Unless the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the American people are willing to follow the brilliant, devoted, and distinguished leadership of the senior Senator from Texas, time will alter, and time will alter for the worse. This is our opportunity; this is our challenge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Alabama remind me of the contributions made to my State by a great Georgian, President Lamar, of the Republic of Texas, who went to Texas from Georgia. One of his statements was something like this:

An educated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free men recognize, and the only ruler free men desire.

President Lamar made that statement more than 100 years ago; but it is just as true today as it was on the day when he made it.

Just as President Lamar, first a citizen of the State of Georgia, made such great contributions to my State, today the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is making a great contribution, in my opinion, not only to the Nation, but also to the entire free world, because it can truly be said that an educated mind is the guardian genius of democracy.

I hope this bill is but a forerunner; but certainly it will produce more educated minds than would be produced if we simply ended the session and went home without doing anything in this field.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Texas for his contribution. As I have said before, no one speaks with greater authority than does he, because no one has given more time, effort, and devoted and brilliant leadership to this cause than has the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. We are seeking to support and sustain him in his leadership for the defense of our country and the survival of our Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] in commending the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for bringing this vitally needed education bill before the Senate today. It is a good bill, and one of which my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I are proud to be cosponsors. We are proud to follow the leadership of the great Senator from Alabama, who is doing such magnificent work in this field. Not only is he doing it at the present time, but during the years his work in this field has made his name immortal.

If the Senator from Alabama will permit me to do so, I should like to join in what he had to say about the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. President, the record of accomplishment of the 85th Congress is to be seen in the activities of the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. When he is on or about the floor, we can be assured that the situation is well in hand and that progress is being made in the consideration and the disposition of proposed legislation, as is the case at the present time. In my opinion, he is one of the greatest leaders this country has ever produced. He has displayed sagacity, understanding, and tolerance in his dealings with his colleagues on the floor. If any saying can correctly be regarded as an indication of the personality of the majority leader, I believe it is one which he is so fond of quoting from Isaiah: "Let us reason together."

Certainly, the President of the United States should be extremely happy and grateful for the fact that he has, in the person of the majority leader, a man who understands the true meaning of responsibility, statesmanship, and the welfare of the country as a whole. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] would not give much comfort to the theories expounded in the books on political science. However, he has, in a practical way, carried to the summit the art of politics and government. His accomplishments speak for themselves, because what he has done is to weld together the diverse elements of the Democratic Party, and at the same time develop an understanding with the Republican Party in connection with the conduct of business in the Senate. It is not an easy job to create and to maintain a degree of tolerance and understanding among the many individuals who comprise the membership of this body. That this has been done is indeed to the great credit of the majority leader, and it speaks well for the conduct of the legislative branch of our Government.

I would be remiss in my remarks if I did not state that much of this cooperation and a great deal of this accomplishment are due to the harmonious working relationship between the majority

leader and the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. Because of the efforts put forth by these two men and by other Members of this body, the 85th Congress will be able to adjourn with a record of accomplishment and of responsibility which no other Congress in recent years can approach.

Mr. President, the bill now under debate is but another indication of the responsibility which the majority leader, the minority leader, and the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the senior Senator from Alabama are displaying in the conduct of the affairs of the Government.

Mr. President, with the permission of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, I should like to ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Yodels for a Texan," which was published in the New York Times of August 12, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to have that done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YODELS FOR A TEXAN—LYNDON JOHNSON
LAUDED FOR GETTING BILLS PASSED WITHOUT
AROUSING ANGER

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 11.—When the leaders of Washington, Republican and Democratic, executive and legislative, start yodeling in unison about the virtues of a single Senator, it is fair to conclude that the Senator (a) has just died, or (b) retired from the Senate, or (c) won a very special place for himself in the Capital. This is what is now happening in the case of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas. The Democratic majority leader has not died or retired; he is merely coming to the end of another congressional session in which he has managed to win approval for a lot of controversial legislation without making anybody angry.

Other Senate leaders with large majorities and powerful Presidents have pushed through more legislation, but it has seldom, if ever, happened that so much controversial legislation has gone through a divided Government with so few cuts and bruises.

IN TROUBLE AT FIRST

When the 2d session of the 84th Congress started last January, the administration's foreign economic program was in serious trouble. Mr. JOHNSON himself feared that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the foreign-aid appropriations would be cut to pieces. Both have come out, not precisely as the administration wanted them, but solidly intact.

Much the same was true of the Pentagon reform bill, but it, too, has survived the interparty and interservice rivalries. Of all the really major objectives, only the labor bill is still in trouble, and House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who taught JOHNSON much of his parliamentary skill, may save that at the last minute.

All this, of course, is not Senator JOHNSON's doing alone. He has developed a strange but genuine partnership with the Senate Republican leader, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California. He worked closely with Mr. RAYBURN and the House Republican leader, JOSEPH MARTIN.

On the tariff, he had intelligent support from C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, who is one of the few good things that has happened to the State Department recently, and on Pentagon reorganization, he established a firm and even

affectionate alliance with Neil H. McElroy, Secretary of Defense.

Nevertheless, everybody from President Eisenhower to Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN agrees that Senator JOHNSON is primarily responsible for the record and nobody quite knows how it was done.

Even Under Secretary Dillon, who followed the tariff bill for the State Department, cannot explain even yet how Senator JOHNSON disentangled the bill from a number of complicated, personal, and parliamentary difficulties.

It is impossible to have a conversation with Senator JOHNSON on the subject. Nobody has a conversation with the Texan. He does all the talking all the time and his talk is as detailed and complicated as his tactics.

As a strategist, he is the best quarterback to come out of Texas since Slingin' Sammy Baugh. He seldom originates legislation himself, but he can take complex human beings and ideas and select or invent ways and means of winning consent for effective compromise legislation.

His assumption is that the Senate is not a seminar in theoretical political ideology but a workshop for passing laws, and while this emphasis on parliamentary skill has earned him the reputation of a political mechanic, it is probably significant that even the theorists in this city are beginning to join in his praise.

Next to his gift for dealing with complicated details and cantankerous human beings, vitality is his great strength. This is one of the odd paradoxes in a very complex man. He has had a severe heart attack and yet burns up more energy than a tank.

Washington is very conscious of this quality at the moment. The heart of the trouble in the executive branch of the Government is the lack of sustained energy at the center. It is not that there are no ideas or programs but that there is very little driving force in the White House to carry things through.

Senator JOHNSON, like President Eisenhower, has political power. But, in addition, he allies immense energy to skill and ideas. The ideas may come from other men, but he will work 18 hours a day putting the thing over and, because he has both political power and physical energy, he achieves objectives other men cannot reach.

He has his weaknesses, like other mortals. The major defect in Congress is that everybody is working on a few trees at a time, and few manage to see the whole forest. Senator JOHNSON does not escape this episodic and narrowing aspect of the Congress, yet even here, his record is better this session than last.

Part of the reason for this is that he has developed an excellent staff in his office. He discovered during the civil-rights debate in the last session that the intellectuals of his party outside and inside the Congress could be useful in defining goals and devising compromise legislation, and he is now using them more than ever before.

As a result of all this, he will go home at the end of this session with broader support within the Democratic Party and the press than he has ever had before. For his cheering section now runs from John Foster Dulles to Dean Acheson, and from HUBERT HUMPHREY to HERMAN TALMADGE, and that is quite a distance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], surprised me. I was about to leave the Chamber, when I heard him speak about me.

I wish to say that, unworthy as I am, I am very grateful that I have friends like him; and I shall try to be humble, worthy, and dedicated to the better things of life which he so well represents.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say that the cause of education, the cause of the defense of our Nation, and the cause of survival for our Nation, have no better, truer, or more devoted friends than the two distinguished Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD]. They always give of their time, their thought, and their best efforts, in working and fighting for the cause of education for the defense of our country.

I know of no better indication of the accuracy of what the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said regarding the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], than the fact that I had no disposition to bring up the pending education bill until I could be sure that the distinguished majority leader would be on the floor.

The testimony of witness after witness before our committee showed very clearly that this Nation must more effectively discover and encourage potential intellectual talent, create wider opportunities for advanced training for gifted young people, and provide better teachers and better teaching equipment to develop the scholastic resources of American youth.

A study conducted by the United States Office of Education indicates that during their high school training only 1 out of 3 students takes a chemistry course; only 1 out of 4, physics; only 1 out of 3, intermediate algebra; and only 1 out of 8, trigonometry or solid geometry. The report shows that about 100,000 seniors attend public high schools where no advanced mathematics of any kind is taught. Sixty-one thousand are in schools which provide instruction in neither physics nor chemistry. Last year 14 States did not require a single course in science or mathematics for graduation.

Mr. President, we know that there is nothing so important for the transmission of ideas as a common language. Yet we find that our people in the United States are about as poorly versed in foreign languages as the people of any great nation could perhaps be. I think the testimony before our committee, given by many eminent witnesses who spoke with authority, could well be summarized by an article which appeared in the New York Times just a few days ago, July 27 last, which stated as follows:

Last winter, at the height of the concern about the content of Russian education, the United States Office of Education obtained the thirty-odd mathematics and science textbooks used in the Soviet elementary-secondary schools.

Six months later—and 10 months after sputnik—those books are still largely unevaluated, because the Office has been unable to find persons with dual competence in Russian—

That is, the Russian language—and in the subject matter—

That is, the scientific subject matter—to make comparisons from partial translations with American school texts.

This is one illustration of the consequences of the poverty of the American schools' offerings in modern foreign languages and foreign cultures, an area ranked in importance immediately behind science and mathematics.

Testifying for legislation intended to help provide more and better language teaching, administration officials last winter told congressional committees that for a nation with worldwide interests we are linguistically unprepared either to defend ourselves in the case of war or to exercise the full force of our leadership in building a peaceful world. They said we are linguistically the most backward major nation in the world, that few Americans available for overseas assignments have had any foreign language training.

In other words, we have to send representatives of our Government and of our Nation to other nations who cannot even speak the language of the other nations, who cannot exchange and transmit ideas, because they cannot speak the common language.

This lack of language preparation on the part of our representatives overseas has been a major handicap in our foreign policy. Because of this deficiency, our representatives are too often unable to engage in the kind of person-to-person relationship which plays such a vital part in many aspects of our foreign affairs, as well as in gaining friendship for our country throughout the world. All of these facts underline the urgency for action now. Fully trained and competent personnel, whether the training be in science, mathematics, technology, or foreign languages, cannot be produced overnight. There can be no crash programs in this type of education. America's position 5, 10, or 20 years from now will be determined largely by what we do today.

While I speak of the compulsion of the hour, of the compulsion to act today, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a few excerpts from the report which the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Derthick, made upon his return not many days ago from Russia. Dr. Derthick, as will be recalled, accompanied ten American educators to Russia, and upon their return Dr. Derthick said:

The slogan we saw most in posters, films, and everywhere was Reach and Overreach America.

Dr. Derthick went on to say:

In education the spirit is a race for knowledge, for supremacy in a way of life and in world leadership. The Russian attitude is, as one Soviet official told us, "We believe in a planned society, you in individual initiative. Let time tell."

And Dr. Derthick added:

They—

That is, the Russians—

are convinced that time is on their side and they can win world supremacy through education and hard work.

This conviction is basic—

He said—

to all of their efforts and all of their plans for the future. Education is paramount. It is a kind of grand passion—this conviction that children, schools, and hard work will win them their place in the sun, and on the moon.

Dr. Derthick summarized the situation by reporting the following evidences of a total Soviet commitment to education:

Classes are of reasonable size.

Teachers are chosen on a highly selective basis.

Then he added:

We saw no indication of any shortage (of teachers).

Foreign languages are widely taught.

The educational process extends after school hours and during the summer under professional direction.

Teachers and principals have an abundance of staff assistants; curriculum experts, doctors, nurses, laboratory assistants, and so forth.

School money is available to do the job.

He added:

We were told repeatedly, "A child can be born healthy, but he cannot be born educated."

Dr. Derthick concluded:

These factors insure vigor and quality in any school system, whether in a communistic society or a democracy.

Then Dr. Derthick added these words about the trip to Russia taken by him and the 10 other educators:

What we have seen has amazed us in one outstanding particular; we were simply not prepared for the degree to which the U. S. S. R., as a nation, is committed to education as a means of national advancement. Everywhere we went we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to a total commitment to education. Our major reaction therefore is one of astonishment * * * at the extent to which this seems to have been accomplished.

Mr. President, that is the challenge which faces us today. That is the challenge which faces us as Members of the United States Senate, in this legislative body of the Federal Government, with its direct and immediate responsibility for the defense of our Nation and, in part, for the conduct of our foreign affairs. This brings home to us in emphatic and ringing terms the fact that our Nation must more effectively discover and encourage its potential intellectual talent, must create wider opportunities for advanced training for gifted young people, and must provide better teachers and teaching equipment so as to develop the scholastic resources of American youth.

If we are to do that, Mr. President, nothing is more important than that we provide incentives to encourage, to stimulate, and to challenge the boys and girls, the youth of America, to develop to the fullest, to make the most of their God-given talents, to train their minds to think, to train their minds to work, to train their minds to analyze, and, when possible, to create.

Of course, this was the thought President Eisenhower had in his mind in his speech last November in Oklahoma, when he urged that Congress pass legislation to provide these incentives, these encouragements, these stimulants, and these challenges to the youth of America.

In reporting S. 4237 to the Senate, the committee has approved a coordinated program for strengthening the national defense through an interrelated set of proposals designed to assist State, local, and private effort to develop America's

brainpower for defense, by stimulating students, teachers, parents, and school authorities to seek the highest possible attainment in learning.

Scholarship awards are offered to stimulate and challenge high-school students to do their best, and to stimulate parents to insist not only that their children work hard, but that their schools provide the proper courses of instruction. Additional scholarship grants based on need will also aid scholarship winners to complete a 4-year college education. Student loans will be available to other highly qualified college students needing financial assistance.

A limited number of fellowship grants are offered those who advance into graduate school to obtain their doctoral degrees and thus better qualify themselves to be college instructors.

Secondary- and elementary-school-teachers will have the opportunity to attend special institutes where they may increase their knowledge of the subjects they teach. Able students will be encouraged to become teachers by a forgiveness feature in the student loan program under which recipients who later enter the teaching profession will have their loans canceled in 5 years at the rate of 20 percent for each year they teach.

The bill provides for aptitude testing of children as they are entering high school, in order to identify the particular talents and potentialities of each child. To assure that all of our children, and especially those most gifted intellectually, can be encouraged to develop their abilities to the maximum, guidance and counseling services will help high-school students along paths of study best suited to their individual capacities, and will give particular attention to urging that the ablest and most promising take the courses that will qualify them for admission to college.

Provision is made for research and experimentation in the use of television and other modern mediums of communication for educational purposes.

To enable students to secure the most benefit from courses in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, grants will be made to State educational agencies, on a matching basis, for purchase of modern laboratory equipment.

To help meet the defense and foreign relations needs of the Nation, language and area centers will be provided to give instruction in the language and culture of foreign peoples, especially those in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and the Soviet Union.

To help assure an adequate supply of technical personnel to assist scientists and engineers, area vocational educational schools will be created to give instruction in techniques and skills essential to the national defense.

To assure that scientists and researchers shall have available to them the latest developments in their fields, there is established a Science Information Service for indexing, abstracting, translating, and distributing to American scientists the findings of scientific research throughout the world.

We recognize, of course, that the primary responsibility for a sound educational system in our country in the future, as in the past, rests with the States, the local communities, the parents, the colleges, and universities, and to this end we specifically and categorically provide in the pending bill that no Federal officer shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution.

But, Mr. President, we can adhere steadfastly and wholeheartedly to this policy and at the same time provide Federal aid, as set forth in this bill, because we have many illustrations of Federal aid which has been provided without interference and without any attempted control on the part of the Government, and in connection with which we have left the primary responsibility with the States, the local communities, the parents, the colleges, and universities.

We of the committee recall that when the very able and distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, was before our committee, he emphasized this very proposition.

Before the Federal Union came into being, in 1785, there was passed the first ordinance making large grants of land to what were to be the States of these United States for educational purposes.

Two years afterward, in 1787, there was passed what is commonly known as the Northwest Ordinance, which, incidentally, Daniel Webster stated was the greatest law of any, because of its recognition of education and because of the large land grants made for the cause of education.

Senators will recall that in the ordinance of 1787 it was declared:

* * * knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the maintenance of education shall be forever encouraged.

And then, as we know, at a later date, in 1862, there was passed what is commonly known as the Land Grant College Act. In that connection, Mr. President, it is interesting to note that when a similar measure was first passed by the Congress it was vetoed by the then President of the United States, President Buchanan. If Senators will read President Buchanan's message vetoing the bill at that time, they will find pretty much the same arguments made about that bill as are being made against aid for education today. But the Congress in its wisdom and with its vision broadened repassed the bill. We then had another President of the United States, a man who, by hard struggle through difficulties and adversity, had won for himself an education, a man of far greater wisdom and vision, Abraham Lincoln. President Lincoln signed the bill into law and gave to us our great land-grant college program. In all the nearly 100 years we have had that program no one has ever come forward with any serious charge that the Government has in any way sought to interfere with or attempted to control the great colleges established under that act.

Of course, we are all familiar with our vocational education program, which came into being at another time of great stress, the time of World War I. The act was passed in 1917. The needs and the necessities of that great struggle brought home to us the need for a program for vocational education, and the Congress passed that act. In all these years the program has worked with great success and provided many, many benefits for the people and for the Nation, without any question of Federal interference or attempted control.

We all know what the Government of the United States has done under the GI bill of rights. In all these different programs the Federal Government has responded to special national needs in education without Federal interference or any attempted control by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, we must pass the proposed legislation because it will stimulate a more rigorous training of the intellects which we must have to meet the challenges to our Nation today. The proposed legislation recognizes that intellectual discipline is essential to our national purpose. Passage of the bill will do much to encourage the American people, and bring them to a fuller realization that we must have in America people with understanding of the process of learning and with respect for knowledge and intellectual attainment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield when he feels the proper moment has arrived?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am distinctly gratified by that portion of the bill which deals with the student loan fund, and I shall support every phase of it, including the scholarship provision.

The distinguished chairman of the committee is entitled to the gratitude of all the people of the country for rendering such a monumental service and drafting legislation so needed in the national defense. He has been able to reconcile a great many diverse points of view and to arrive at a sound conclusion.

I had the privilege of testifying before the committee in connection with the proposal outlined in Senate bill 1727, which I introduced, and which was sponsored also by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Payne], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall]. That bill called for substantially the program now set forth in title 3 of the bill in direct loans to State agencies, in almost the same amount. We asked for \$250 million.

There is another phase of that program about which I should like to ask the Senator, and that is the idea of a \$750 million revolving guaranty fund, to apply an FHA type of guaranty to student loans, made either by State agencies, by banks and other institutions, or by educational institutions themselves.

There are certain fiscal limitations; and certainly the bill before us shows that attention has been paid to the fiscal limitations. The type of approach

which I have in mind is the technique which has been employed in connection with housing, and which might be employed in connection with education, in order materially to expand student loan opportunities. All of us must recognize the essentiality of the student loan approach, in order to enlarge the possibilities with relation to scholarships, no matter how generous we might wish to be in the field of scholarships.

I am delighted with the bill. I believe the Senator from Alabama has rendered a great service to the country. The Senator from New York was interested in knowing whether any consideration had been given to the FHA type of approach in connection with the student loan program, going beyond the program in the bill.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York made a very fine and helpful statement before our committee.

In reply to his question, there is a loan program in the bill, but not the FHA type of program to which the Senator has referred. There is a loan program in the bill, but not that particular type.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator feel that the door is open for the consideration of that type of program if enough supporters can be found for it?

Mr. HILL. The door is open. I will say to my distinguished friend what the distinguished majority leader said earlier. I believe that this bill is the first step. In a short time the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in consultation with other Members of the Senate, such as the distinguished Senator from New York, who is very much interested in this subject, will consider most carefully another step that should be taken to promote the aims and purposes we have in mind in bringing this bill before the Senate.

As chairman of the committee, I assure the Senator from New York that the proposal which he presented has received my study, and will continue to receive my most careful thought and study.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I hope that next year those of us who are still in the Senate will join in an effort to put the proposal in the form of legislation.

I thank my colleague, and congratulate him for the monumental service he has rendered to the people of the country.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York is most generous and kind. However, the bill is the result of teamwork. Members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare seek always to work as a team, and they did work as a team in bringing this bill before the Senate.

I note the presence in the Chamber of the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith] and also the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Education. The bill was the work of the team, in an effort to bring before the Senate the best possible bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I join my colleague in recognition of the work of the other committee members. When I spoke of the chairman, I was speaking of him in a representative capacity.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I might continue for many hours discussing this subject. Our committee held hearings, the printed record of which comprises some 1,700 pages of testimony. We sought to go into this subject with great care, and with the consideration which the challenge compelled.

I close by quoting the words of Edmund Burke, spoken some 200 years ago. He declared:

Education is the chief defense of nations.

Burke has long been held to be perhaps the foremost and most prophetic of British statesmen. Surely those words were words of wisdom. "Education is the chief defense of nations." Those words have a peculiar and appealing application to our country today.

At a little later date Horace Mann, the great pioneer and leader in the American public education system, declared:

Education is our only political safety. Outside of this ark all is deluge.

In 1920, about 38 years ago, one of the foremost historians in the record of nations, H. G. Wells, declared:

History becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.

I could select no words which would better summarize the situation which confronts us today, and the challenge which faces us as Senators and faces the American people, than those words:

History becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.

The bill before the Senate, as reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, bespeaks the determination of an aroused American people, and of both great political parties, to unite in an effort to meet the present challenge to the defense of our country, the present challenge to the survival of our nation, and to insure the continued intellectual eminence of the United States. It is a challenge to keep America strong that we may keep America free.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I did not desire to interrupt the Senator in his very stirring address, but I wish to express to him at this time my appreciation for the many hours, days, and weeks of fine and devoted service he has rendered in connection with the hearings and in the drafting of the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

In doing so I also wish to pay tribute to the ranking minority member, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith], and the other members of the committee, who also have worked very hard on the bill—not without disagreement—in bringing the proposed legislation to its present point. I particularly wish to express publicly my appreciation for the fine and great work which the chairman of the committee has done on the bill.

Mr. HILL. I thank my distinguished friend from Colorado. The record will

show that in all the days and weeks we considered the bill the distinguished Senator from Colorado was always there. We held many hearings—mornings and afternoons, and many hours of executive session, both by the subcommittee and by the full committee—and the man who always was there, making his contribution and giving us the benefit of his fine thought and work in the cause of education, was the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I thank him for the many fine contributions he has made to the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, before I begin my own remarks on the subject I wish to associate myself with the fine remarks which have been made by the majority leader and by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] with regard to the services rendered by the chairman of our committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in this work. The Senator from Alabama and I have been members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for 14 years, and in our struggling through many hearings in the consideration of many subjects we have acquired an approach which is free of partisan politics, which is as it should be in considering these subjects.

Aside from my great personal affection and respect for the Senator from Alabama, I wish to commend him particularly for his willingness and eagerness to confer on this type of proposed legislation, which has to do with the security of our country, on the basis of an all-American front, which all of us are trying to work for, and without considering politics. I have in mind particularly his participation, for example, in the conferences we had with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from time to time when the bill was progressing in committee, and his cooperation with my good friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who was the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

My association with these Senators has been one of the bright spots of this year and of all the years I have had an opportunity to work in this field of human welfare. I congratulate the Senator from Alabama on his inspiring presentation of the subject today.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that on Thursday of last week I endeavored to speak of my appreciation of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, and particularly to express my deep regret that this is his last session as a Member of the Senate. In my remarks on last Thursday, I referred to the fine cooperation which has existed between the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Alabama, and how intimately and closely we have worked together. I wish to say again today that no one could have had a finer or better teammate than I have had in the Senator from New Jersey.

As the ranking minority member of the committee, he has been there all the time, making fine contributions and doing everything he could through his efforts and his leadership to serve our

country and to bring forth a bill which would do the very best for the United States of America. I thank him and congratulate him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, beginning on line 10, it is proposed to strike out all after "shall be given" through line 14, and insert, in lieu thereof, the following:

(A) To those persons whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign language, and (B) primarily to persons with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's amendment very much improves and strengthens the language in the bill. He called attention to this matter in committee when we were considering the bill. He has given his best thought to this subject, and I believe the amendment improves and strengthens the bill. Certainly it clarifies it. It is a good amendment, and it should be adopted. I hope it may be approved at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator. I believe it is a clarifying amendment and a good amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I endorse everything the Senator from Alabama has said about the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the consideration of the pending bill, consultants to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may have the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I strongly urge the passage of S. 4237, the National Defense Education Act of 1958. I believe it offers a sound and necessary emergency program which will strengthen our educational system significantly. Its approach is similar to both S. 3163, the administration bill which I introduced, and S. 3187, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Senator HILL. The committee bill, S. 4237, represents a reasonable compromise between the two points of view. They and other bills were of great help in our effort to get together on the pending bill.

EDUCATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

I do not claim that this bill will solve all the serious educational problems which handicap our schools today. No one bill, and no amount of Federal funds, could accomplish that purpose.

What this bill attempts to do is to strengthen the national defense through the fuller development of our potential

national resources of talented manpower. Section 101 declares that:

We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will demonstrate our country's recognition of and esteem for those of our students who have striven to develop their intellectual abilities to the fullest extent; will make available greater intellectual opportunities challenging to our youth; will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational program which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology; and will provide means to make it possible for our teachers to enrich their knowledge of the subject matter which they teach.

To put it another way: in this first year of the space age, the interests of national security require that the more effective mobilization of our national brainpower should receive the top priority for Federal action in the field of education.

Last February when Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Foreign Relations Committee, there occurred this colloquy:

Senator FULBRIGHT. Do you think that a substantial effort directed to increasing the quality of our educational system would tend to improve our military posture relative to the Soviet Union?

General TWINING. I think that is probably the most important thing this country can do.

Similarly, when President Eisenhower gave his state of the Union address last January, he listed among our imperative needs an education program designed principally to encourage improved teaching quality and student opportunities in the interests of national security and complemented by a major expansion of the National Science Foundation's activities in science education.

To strengthen our position against international communism, the President warned, we must make maximum use of our tremendous potential resources in education, science, research, and, not least, the ideas and principles by which we live.

The bill provides the means for utilizing these resources more effectively. As such, it should be considered as an integral part of the national defense program, an essential security requirement. This is clearly the way the President intended his education program to be considered.

THE LAG IN THE EDUCATIONAL EFFORT

The bill, then, will strengthen national security by strengthening the Nation's educational system. Certainly there is overwhelming evidence that the system needs strengthening. The recent Rockefeller brothers report on education was simply restating a well-known fact in its declaration that:

Our schools are overcrowded, understaffed, and ill-equipped. In the fall of 1957, the shortage of public school classrooms stood at 142,000. There were 1,943,000 pupils in excess of normal classroom capacity. Some elementary and high schools and colleges

had found it impossible to hire well-qualified teachers in such basic subjects as English, languages, and social sciences; some have even had to drop chemistry, physics, and mathematics from their curriculum since there were no teachers to teach them.

It is tragic that this situation has been precipitated by neglect. We, as a people, have too long taken for granted the great free system of public education which has been such a vital factor in shaping our national destiny.

The damaging lag in our educational effort has become a matter of increasing Federal concern in recent years. In 1955, 1956, and 1957, the Eisenhower administration proposed broad programs of aid for school construction.

Then suddenly, almost overnight, the rush of events symbolized by the launching of the Russian sputniks gave new emphasis and clarity to national security requirements. The administration had to revise its education program in the perspective of these requirements. As a result, school construction was temporarily deferred, and top educational priority was placed on the program embodied in the bill now before us.

THE DEFERMENT OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

This shifting of priorities has been both widely misunderstood and unjustly criticized. It is time to speak frankly on the subject.

One of the factors in the decision to defer school construction was its entanglement in the issue of school integration. After the tragic incidents of last fall, the division of national opinion on desegregation as reflected in Congress strongly indicated that school construction this year had become a practical impossibility. Any consideration of such a bill, it appeared, would inevitably raise the integration question and arouse bitter controversy.

In my judgment, the intervening months have not altered this situation. For this reason I am convinced that an attempt to add a school construction amendment to this bill would jeopardize passage of any legislation this year.

As one who has strongly and consistently supported Federal aid for school construction in the past, I deeply regret the prospect of delaying this much needed assistance for another year. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the administration acted in the best interests of education when it postponed its plans for school construction.

In addition to the fact that significant Federal aid was needed this year to strengthen the schools, there were plenty of strong educational reasons to justify a shift in priorities from classroom construction to the development of talent. I shall now outline some of these reasons.

THE TOP PRIORITY OF EDUCATIONAL NEED: QUALITY MANPOWER

The need to develop more trained, high-talent manpower has long ranked high on the list of educational priorities. It is a need which has increasingly troubled farsighted leaders in government, industry, and education. Many of them have repeatedly urged that this problem should receive primary attention.

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, then Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, warned in early 1955 that:

If there is to be another * * * war among the great nations of the world * * * such a war will almost certainly be lost by the country with the fewest resources in trained manpower.

General Electric Corp., in the fall of that year, took full-page advertisements in national newspapers to state that:

For every 5 new engineers industry needed this year only 3 were graduates from United States colleges. We have opportunities for a thousand more technically trained people each year. The need may double in the next 10 years.

The Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy reported in July 1956 that:

The shortage of skilled talent in this country is a very real problem and one with which we must come to grips if we are to maintain the present rate of growth which is so essential to the Nation's strength and well-being.

The report noted, for instance, that the shortage of skilled manpower in the field of nuclear energy is the greatest single deterrent to progress in our atomic energy program. At the same time, the committee stressed that such shortages should be understood as part of a total shortage of trained individuals in every field, and concluded that our main objective should be the development of all our intellectual resources.

EDUCATORS CALL FOR HIGHER STANDARDS

Educators in particular have voiced their concern over the need for higher quality in education.

This spring, the educational policies commission of the National Education Association summed up the contemporary challenge to American education as necessarily involving at the least, increased attention to the gifted young people in schools that are designed for all young people, improved guidance in planning programs suited to individual talents and capacities, and improvement in teaching and the status of teaching.

Several weeks ago, at their annual meeting in Cleveland, NEA delegates heard John M. Stalnaker, president of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, urge the abolishment of the cult of easiness in the schools. He charged that the schools, backed by parental indifference, have failed to meet the needs of talented students, and that intellectual excellence does not rank high enough in our values.

A Gallup poll last spring which, unfortunately, did not receive the attention it deserved, revealed that a solid 79 percent of the Nation's high-school principals feel today's schools demand too little from their students.

A subsequent poll of American parents illustrated that the public has not yet fully grasped the importance of strengthening educational standards. In contrast to the school principals, the parents polled were not concerned by the inadequacies of the curriculum so much as the lack of bigger and better classrooms. With the school men, the priority of importance was reversed.

The Rockefeller brothers report, while rightly pointing up the critical need for greater public support of education, dealt principally with the problem of quality. This emphasis was made clear in its title, "The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America," and amplified in its text:

At the precollege level, the gravest problem today is to reach some agreement on priorities in subject matter. This problem is particularly critical for those academically talented students who will go on to college. Particularly with respect to the highest priority subjects, we must modernize and improve the quality of the courses themselves.

The report found further that—

The crisis in our science education is not an invention of the newspapers, or scientists, or the Pentagon. It is a real crisis. * * * The heart of the matter is that we are moving with headlong speed into a new phase in man's long struggle to control his environment, a phase beside which the industrial revolution may appear a modest alteration of human affairs. Nuclear energy, exploration of outer space, revolutionary studies of brain functioning, important new work on the living cell—all point to changes in our lives so startling as to test to the utmost our adaptive capacities. We need quality and we need it in considerable quantity. We must develop guidance efforts designed to reach all able youngsters, and we must engage in a major expansion of the facilities for science teaching.

The evidence is undeniable that an imbalance has developed in our educational system which has led to insufficient attention to mathematics, science, and modern languages in the curriculum of the average high school. The scientists themselves, however, readily agree that the primary need is for a general strengthening of the whole curriculum. Speaking for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Laurence H. Snyder, dean of the graduate school of the University of Oklahoma, made this statement before the Labor Committee last February:

The primary requirement in education today is to improve the quality of education, especially education in science and mathematics. We need more and better school buildings. We need to pay our teachers more adequate salaries. We need to overcome the handicaps that prevent some bright students from attending college. But, above all, we need to offer education in higher quality to the students who will be the teachers, the statesmen, the scientists, and the leaders in business and other fields of tomorrow.

THE RUSSIAN CHALLENGE

The need for greater stress on quality education has been brought into sharper focus in the last 10 months by the dramatic evidence of Russian progress in science and technology. As Dr. Howard Bevis warned last fall in submitting the report of the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers:

Today, Russia has more scientists, engineers, and technicians than the United States, and is graduating more than twice as many each year. * * * The rate of Russian progress in most scientific fields is so rapid that, unless we broaden and strengthen our own efforts, there will be little question of Soviet superiority 5 or 10 years from now.

The committee report itself declared:

Not only our self-interest but this country's inescapable obligations to the free world demand that we do not allow our technological progress to fall behind that of a power which seeks to challenge the free world economically, politically, and militarily.

Sputnik I proved that these warnings of approaching crisis were not exaggerated, and that we had actually fallen behind the Russians in some fields.

The central fact about the Russian challenge is that it is based on a "total commitment to education," as Commissioner Derthick observed in June after a month-long study of Russian schools. In the Soviet's grand strategy to achieve world technological supremacy, education is the primary weapon.

In a remarkably short span of years, Russia has progressed from a nation of illiterates to one with millions in the schools. These millions are the servants of the state, pawns in the Communist strategy. They are given a strong curriculum and forced to meet high educational standards. Attractive rewards are provided for intellectual accomplishments, and special incentives encourage superior minds into scientific and technological fields. Teachers are chosen on a highly selective basis. They are well paid, and are given abundant staff assistance.

The Russian emphasis on education is only just beginning to produce results. Our real problem of competition will come in another decade. This fact places on us the heavy responsibility for action now. Education is a long process. As Dr. Detlev Bronk told the Labor Committee last March:

What we are doing now educationally is going to affect our position and our status nationally 10, 15, and 20 years from now. There can be no crash program in education.

EDUCATION TO MEET THE CHALLENGE

We do not know, and we cannot say, that sputnik was a direct result of Russia's commitment to education. But sputnik was a stark dramatization and symbol of Russian scientific and technological progress. As such, it was a clearcut mandate for action to develop our manpower resources more effectively. This is essentially an educational problem. Therefore, from the standpoint of the national interest, it has become the most critical educational problem.

Certainly too, in the development of our manpower we must place our hopes on quality. Our Nation of 170 million is obviously unable to match our opponents in terms of quantity when the Communists' total commitment to education is supported by the 800 million people of Russia and China.

MAJOR AREAS OF WEAKNESS

Faced with the Russian challenge, we must acknowledge that we are neither developing nor using our national brainpower and technical talent to anything approaching full capacity. We must not permit this waste to continue. To do so would be to imperil the national security just as surely as would an undermanned, undertrained military force.

What, then, are the most important areas in which Federal action can help to strengthen the educational system? Exhaustive study and consultation with educators throughout the country by the Office of Education, and detailed expert testimony during 3 months of hearings by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has produced general agreement on three principal areas in which the weaknesses of the educational system are particularly apparent, and in which Federal aid could contribute added strength to an important degree.

These three areas are: the identification and motivation of talent; the training of teachers, particularly in scientific subjects; and the teaching of these subjects, particularly at the secondary level. I shall discuss each one.

1. THE NEED FOR TALENT

First, the identification and motivation of talent.

The estimate of the Office of Education is that, each year, between 100,000 and 200,000 young people in the top quarter of their class either drop out of high school before graduation, or, having graduated, do not go on to college.

This is a shocking index of wasted manpower. It is apparent that, unless we greatly expand the opportunities for all students to develop their talents according to their ability, we simply will not have enough highly trained, highly educated men and women in future years to meet the demands of our growing economy or maintain the vitality of our democratic processes or uphold our position of leadership in the struggle of the free world against communism's atheistic totalitarianism.

Therefore, it should be a matter of prime concern to all Americans that a top-quality education is readily available to all who have the capacity for it.

2. THE NEED FOR TEACHERS

Second, the training of teachers. The teacher shortage is particularly acute at the college level. The need for more qualified college teachers was singled out by the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School as the most critical single problem facing higher education today.

The graduate schools of the Nation are turning out only a small proportion of the doctors of philosophy needed to meet the anticipated bulge in college enrollments expected in the years just ahead. If our most talented youngsters are to develop their maximum educational potential, the teachers must be there when they are needed.

Therefore, it is in the national interest to encourage the graduate schools of the country to expand their facilities and enrollments now, and to stimulate more students to consider a graduate education as a preparation for teaching.

At the secondary level the teacher shortage is particularly acute in the field of science, mathematics and languages. The biggest single reason why so many students graduate from high school with inadequate preparation in these subjects is because there are not enough teachers to teach them.

Half of our high schools, mostly the smaller ones, offer no modern language training at all. Better paid jobs in private industry attract more than a third of the already inadequate number of men and women trained to teach science and mathematics. Only about a third of today's teachers of science and mathematics majored in those subjects in college.

Our future national level of scientific achievement is directly related to a restoration of the proper balance of science to the curriculum. Therefore, it is in the national interest to encourage higher standards and greater interest in secondary teaching in these fields.

3. THE NEED FOR STRENGTHENING CURRICULUM

Third, there is the critical need for a more balanced program in fundamental academic subjects, particularly in science, mathematics and languages.

Only about 1 out of 3 of our high-school graduates have taken chemistry, only 1 out of 4 physics, 1 out of 3 algebra, and 1 out of 8 trigonometry or solid geometry. At a time when it is so essential to make ourselves understood throughout the world, less than 15 percent of our high-school students study any foreign language. By contrast, all students in Russia's 10-year schools are required to study foreign languages for 6 years, and the average Russian student receives 5 to 6 times more mathematics and science instruction than is generally required in American schools.

It is in the national interest that our young people obtain better training in the fundamentals of science, mathematics, and languages. Those who have interest and ability in these subjects will then be more likely to discover and develop their talents. They will not have a scientific or technical career foreclosed to them later due to the lack of a solid curriculum in high school. And, whether or not they enter technical fields of specialization, all students will then carry into their careers a broader and deeper understanding of the modern world which will make their contribution to the Nation greater.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION

I have listed three areas of need which require a nationwide effort. It would be unrealistic to expect each local school district in America to act as promptly as today's circumstances demand. Therefore, the Federal Government must assume a share of the responsibility.

The Federal role should be to encourage and assist—not to control or supplant—State, local, and private effort. It should provide leadership by calling attention to critical national needs, and by offering incentives for the States and communities to adopt effective plans to meet these needs. In this way the interests of the people as a whole will be served, and the basic American premise that education is primarily a local, State, and private responsibility will be maintained.

HOW THE BILL STRENGTHENS EDUCATION

Senate bill 4237 provides for a 4-year emergency program which will strengthen the educational system in each of

the three principal areas of weakness which I have discussed.

First, the identification and motivation of talent. In this area the bill provides a series of interrelated programs.

Matching grants to the States will finance a regular program of testing to identify the abilities and aptitudes of all secondary school children. Under the same provision, guidance and counseling programs will be promoted in the public schools to encourage students of outstanding ability to prepare themselves for higher education.

A meaningful program of national defense scholarships will place a premium on academic achievement and give added integrity to the guidance and testing provisions. The program will be large enough to challenge a great number of able students. The resulting competition will provide added impetus for them to seek higher education, and will stimulate a State-by-State reexamination of educational standards. The scholarship program will, in effect, symbolize a new national recognition of the importance of intellectual excellence.

A broad student-loan program will result in a major expansion of opportunity, literally assuring that every qualified student will have a chance to attend college.

A limited and highly selective national defense fellowship program will provide further motivation for the ablest students to engage in advanced study in their fields.

While the scholarship, loan, and fellowship titles stipulate that special consideration shall be given to those with superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern language, I should like to stress that this language in no way limits the students' complete freedom to select their own courses of study or to choose their own colleges or universities.

Second, the need for teachers: Two titles of the bill will provide particularly effective aid in this critical area. They are the student-loan and the graduate-fellowship programs.

The loan program not only gives preference to students who plan to teach; it also provides forgiveness of the loan for those who actually engage in teaching. This program will effect a large-scale increase in the number of able students preparing to teach, since it offers an incentive at the very time when the financial burden of completing an education is a most serious deterrent to entering such an underpaid profession. It will also reduce the loss of prospective teachers and other talented students who, due to economic hardship, drop out of college.

The fellowship title offers awards primarily for persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education. Each fellowship also carries with it a cost-of-education grant to the institution if it undertakes to expand its graduate program for the training of college teachers. Thus, more outstanding teaching candidates will be encouraged to pursue advanced study; and the graduate schools will be encouraged to enlarge their teacher-training programs.

The third of the points we should consider if we are to bolster our educational system is as follows: The need for strengthening curriculum and teaching. Here, matching grants to the States will provide funds to strengthen science, mathematics, and foreign-language instruction in the public elementary and secondary schools. The money will be used to acquire laboratory and visual-aid equipment, remodel laboratory facilities, and expand the supervisory services of the States in these fields. Funds will also be allotted for loans to enable private schools to purchase similar equipment.

A program of teacher institutes will be established by the Commissioner of Education, through contracts with the colleges and universities, for the purpose of improving the qualifications of personnel engaged in counseling and guidance, modern foreign-language teaching, and the teaching of other subjects "in which shortages of adequately trained teaching personnel are impeding the national defense effort."

These institutes will complement the National Science Foundation's institutes for mathematics and science teachers, which are being greatly expanded this year, as recommended by the President, and will make it possible for teachers of all the so-called hard-core subjects in the curriculum to enrich their knowledge of the subject matter which they teach.

Teaching effectiveness will be further aided by a federally sponsored program of research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, film strips and other audio visual techniques—a study which will encourage the States and local educational agencies to make better use of these mediums.

OTHER AREAS STRENGTHENED BY THE BILL

Senate bill 4237 also provides for the setting up of several programs which promote the more effective use of the national intellectual resources in other areas of specialized need.

In addition to the institutes set up to improve the qualifications of language teachers, the Commissioner will be authorized to establish centers for language and area studies, particularly in the languages of the Middle East, Asia and Africa. These centers will help meet the pressing need for Americans whose knowledge of the languages and customs of foreign countries qualifies them for overseas service in the Government or in business or industry.

Another title expands the existing vocational education program "to meet national defense requirements for personnel equipped to render skilled assistance in fields particularly affected by scientific and technological developments." This provision reflects substantial testimony as to the increasing shortage of scientific technicians who are needed to support our scientists in the conduct of their research.

Another title directs the National Science Foundation to establish a Science Information Service. The discoveries and theories of foreign scientists will be made more readily available to our own scientists and scholars

through more effective translation and dissemination of scientific information from abroad.

The final title of the bill contains a provision for matching grants to improve the statistical services of the State educational agencies. This is needed to obtain a sound evaluation of our national strengths and deficiencies in education. At the present time, Commissioner Derthick testified before the Labor Committee, we have "less information about our children than we have about our hogs."

FAR MORE THAN A SCHOLARSHIP BILL

It should be obvious by now that this is not a scholarship bill, much less a science-scholarship bill, as the press has persisted in describing it. Such a description hinders public understanding of the bill, because the scholarship program is but a component part of this legislation, no more important than the several other parts. The heart of the bill lies in its several closely related programs for the early identification of talented students and their guidance and motivation toward the fuller development of their abilities.

In this view, scholarships are not the principal means to the objective. They are, rather, an additional incentive, a reward for achievement, a tangible evidence of the Nation's serious interest in the encouragement of intellectual excellence.

Far more than a scholarship bill, this bill is what it declares itself to be: namely, a bill which provides a program to strengthen the national defense by promoting the fullest development of our potential resources of talented manpower. I believe that, under the present circumstances, this kind of emergency program must have the top priority for Federal aid to education.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BILL

Finally, I wish to declare my confidence that the enactment of this bill will have far-reaching significance for American education. I am convinced of this for several reasons:

First. The bill will provide effective Federal leadership in bringing about a general strengthening of our entire educational system.

Second. It will retain primary responsibility for education where it traditionally belongs. Its system of matching grants will stimulate greatly increased efforts in support of education on the part of the States, the local communities, and private sources.

I wish to emphasize that point the center of gravity of education in this country must remain in the States, the local communities, and the private sources; that is of paramount importance.

Third, and most important to my mind, is the more intangible, long-range influence the bill will have on the national attitude toward education.

Most of our fundamental educational problems—poorly paid and poorly qualified teachers, inadequate classrooms, anachronistic school districting, and the rest—have their roots in our national failure to place intellectual achievement high enough in our scale of values.

This legislative program marks the Federal Government's first clear recognition of the vital relationship of education to the strength and security of the Nation. The renewed encouragement and respect which the bill will bring to the pursuit of intellectual excellence will, in the long run, contribute most significantly to the solution of our educational problems.

Mr. President, it was my original intention to offer an amendment reducing the number of scholarships provided in the bill. However, I have decided not to press this amendment, in light of the House action on last Friday which entirely eliminated the scholarship title from the House version of the bill.

In the belief that it now seems advisable to go to conference with a larger scholarship program, and in the interest of getting to conference as quickly as possible, I shall seek passage of Senate bill 4237 substantially in the form in which it was reported to the Senate.

I am deeply disturbed by the House action in regard to the scholarship title.

The scholarship program proposed in the bill symbolizes national recognition of the importance of intellectual achievement. It gives added integrity to the guidance and testing provisions of the bill by creating a further impetus for highly talented students to pursue a higher education. The competition for national defense scholarships will challenge a large number of students, thereby stimulating a State-by-State reexamination of educational standards.

These purposes are eminently desirable, and are entirely distinct from those of the loan program, which simply aims to broaden the opportunities for able students to go to, and remain in, college.

I agree with the President that 10,000 scholarships will provide an adequate program for these purposes. The present bill authorizes approximately 23,000, a substantially larger number. However, I now feel that a reduction of the scholarship title by the Senate would make it difficult to come out of conference with a program large enough to be meaningful.

Therefore, Mr. President, my conclusion is that the Senate should pass the bill in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate—including the provision of 23,000 scholarships, because by proceeding in that way, probably we shall be able to arrive finally at a provision for a reasonable number of scholarships. In view of the fact that in the House the scholarship provision was eliminated, it is my hope that as a result of the procedure I now propose, the scholarship figure finally reached by the conferees will be in line with the President's recommendation for 10,000 scholarships.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the other day, all of us had much to say

about the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will soon terminate his service in the Senate. We spoke in glowing terms which were entirely deserved.

Today, we have the honor of noting his participation in connection with this historic education bill. His efforts in this connection certainly warrant all the encomiums which have been heaped upon him. I think for his own satisfaction it is well for him to know that we said what we did, not merely because we are very fond of him, but because our statements were based on the kind of solid achievement which is evidenced by the historic contribution the Senator from New Jersey has made to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend from New York for his kind words.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS ON THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President of the United States has just made a very important, indeed an historic, speech to the United Nations on the Middle East.

His essential points are:

First, that our Nation will aid the small nations to maintain their independence. We have shown we are willing to do that, even at the risk of the commitment of our forces.

Second, that a United Nations force should be created to deal with the problem of direct and indirect aggression.

Third, that monitoring of radio broadcasts should take place, as radio can be the organ for indirect aggression, as Radio Damascus and Radio Cairo have shown in the last few days.

Finally, that the great American example of the Marshall Plan of self-help and mutual cooperation should be carried out through a Middle East Economic Development Corporation, by the Arab nations themselves, if they wish to join in it, under the guidance and leadership of the Secretary General of the United Nations, to which we will contribute.

The President's speech shows the sincerity and good faith of the United States, and it shows that we mean to exert our best efforts to unite the free world. It should be clear, also, that our country will not be blackmailed or diverted from its discharge of free world leadership for world peace.

The speech points out the constructive aspects of Arab nationalism, and shows a respect which should impress anyone who is not trying to get together a private power empire, but who has a true respect for Arab nationalism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I read in this morning's newspaper of the President's visit to the United Nations General Assembly, and, of course, I have had the privilege of reading the President's message on the ticker of the Associated Press and the United Press-INS.

I for one want to join the Senator from New York in commending the

President on this act of statesmanship and leadership. The proposals as outlined by the President are very meritorious. As I said some time ago, I thought the period for recrimination and argument was long past. I believe what we need to think about now is the future and the implementation of the proposals.

The President has laid down now a program for the agencies of our own Government, for the United Nations, and, I might add, for the Congress. I am hopeful each and every one of us will give it the support which it so justly deserves.

I was one of those who felt the President should go before the United Nations. I am pleased he has seen fit to do so. He shall have my support in his efforts.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to identify myself with the remarks made by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota. I did not have the privilege of following through on the matter, so I am not familiar with the details. I am very happy indeed that our colleagues have realized the effect of the President's personal presence before the United Nations. I am glad the President's contribution to world peace and the strengthening of the United Nations has been emphasized.

ECONOMIC TRAGEDY IN LEADVILLE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a short time ago the Senate passed a bill called by the short title of the minerals stabilization program. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Rocky Mountain News be included as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD. This editorial points up very definitely what the real problem and trouble is with our minerals industry, and how it has reacted in a particular situation in the town of Leadville, Colo.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC TRAGEDY IN LEADVILLE

The 2-mile high city of Leadville is now experiencing its greatest economic hardship since gold was discovered in California Gulch.

As a result of the 18-day-old strike against the Climax Molybdenum Co., there is not a single miner working in the entire area. Only 95 men are employed in the smelter, and they are handling ore from South America.

The bells of Annunciation Church are calling people to daily prayer that the strike might be ended. And well the bells might toll mournfully, for the economic results of this strike have been tragic to the whole city.

More than 1,100 men are out of jobs. The only large payroll in the whole area has been cut drastically. Everyone in the city in one form or another is feeling the pinch.

The strike was called when Climax Molybdenum was forced to reduce its working schedule from 6 days to 5 because of high reserves of concentrates and narrowing markets.

This meant that the men would lose a day's wages at time and a half. With an automatic wage increase of 8 cents an hour in July, the men were receiving an average

of \$2.51 an hour. This came to an average wage of \$130.52 per week when they were working 6 days.

On the 5-day week they would receive an average of \$100.40 per week. The union insisted that they must receive a substantial increase to make up in part for the wages they would lose as a result of the loss of sixth-day overtime.

They demanded a 13-percent increase in hourly wages, to bring the average hourly wage to \$2.84 or an average wage of \$113.60 a week.

The company replied that, with the automatic increase in July and the present condition of their markets, there is no justification for further increases.

The company has 16 million pounds of ore concentrates in reserve. Under present market conditions this will suffice for a year. So the company for a long time can ride along without problems.

But it is the striking men and their families—and the whole city of Leadville—who will really begin to suffer. We are glad to note that a negotiation meeting was held Thursday between the company and union representatives.

These meetings must be kept in progress until this unfortunate strike is settled, and Leadville breathes comfortably again.

FATHER CONWAY—PROFESSOR AND STATESMAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many loyal and devoted organizations and individuals in our country are hard at work in advancing the cause of world disarmament. The contribution these men and women are making to world peace and to a better life for all of us is invaluable. Among all those who labor in the vineyard of peace, however, I am sure there is no one who labors more devotedly and more energetically than my good friend, the Reverend Edward A. Conway, S. J., of Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr. The character of his work is unique. So far as I know, he is the only professor of political science in this broad land of ours who teaches a complete course devoted to the problem of disarmament. If there are any other professors in our college and university world who teach such courses, I would be extremely happy to be informed of their existence.

Father Conway has for many years been a keen student of the problem of controlling armaments. He has manifested in many ways his profound interest in the activities of the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament and in other activities of the Senate and of the Congress that are related to the goal of world peace. At the end of last month, when the Subcommittee on Disarmament, as it was then constituted, transferred its functions to a new standing Subcommittee on Disarmament, established by the Foreign Relations Committee, I received a letter from Father Conway in which he commented very kindly upon the work and functions of the subcommittee over the past 3 years. The subcommittee, he wrote in his letter, "exemplified the congressional investigative role at its best." He had many pleasant things to say about the members of the subcommittee and about their accomplishments.

So that the other members of the subcommittee and all the Members of this

body might have an opportunity to read Father Conway's observations in full, I request permission, Mr. President, to insert a copy of his letter at the end of my remarks.

I should also like to take this occasion to say to my colleagues on the subcommittee that I echo and reecho all of Father Conway's praise for their skill and diligence. I have enjoyed tremendously having had the opportunity to work with them, and I am deeply grateful for the contributions they have made over the past several years to the success of the subcommittee.

Father Conway has also sent me a copy of the syllabus of the course he teaches, which I would like to insert, if I may, Mr. President, at the close of my remarks. Just to run one's eyes over it is practically a liberal education in the subject of disarmament. The thoroughness of the author's approach and his appreciation of the complexities and ramifications of the problem are obvious. I would be overjoyed, Mr. President, if our inclusion of this syllabus in the RECORD today would serve as an inspiration to other professors in other colleges and universities to introduce systematic courses, similar to that taught by Father Conway, in this crucial problem of our age—a problem in which all too many of us are ill- or uninformed.

I personally wish I had the opportunity to drink at the well of wisdom and knowledge Father Conway has tapped at Creighton. I wish every American had the same opportunity. These subjects he covers are at the heart of our national security and well-being. I wonder how well we might do if we took the examination on the subjects of disarmament, peace, and security which he gives to his students in Omaha.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, Mr. President, a copy of an examination given by Father Conway to his class, and I invite the Members of this body and every reader of the RECORD to see how well he can do in it. Then I would suggest that each volunteer for the examination thoughtfully ponder the results.

I also ask permission to include in the RECORD at this point, Mr. President, a course-syllabus prepared by Father Conway, which illustrates the complexities of the subject and suggests the size of the task we have before us, and also an excerpt from a statement I made in the preface to a staff study published by the Disarmament Subcommittee which is alluded to in Father Conway's letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL EXAMINATION—POLITICAL SCIENCE 160:
"THE SECURING OF PEACE"—AUGUST 2, 1958

1. Explain these terms: (1) deterrence; (2) disengagement; (3) stalemate; (4) anonymous (suitcase) war; (5) unwanted war.

2. What is the difference between "massive deterrence" and "massive retaliation"? Discuss "massive deterrence" as the guarantor big power peace.

3. What is the "arms race"? How does it stand now? Do you consider it a cause or a symptom of the present international tensions? Reasons for answer.

4. What is the so-called atomic diplomacy? Describe one incident in which it has been used.

5. Why is the control of ballistic missiles so important? Comment on the statement: "It is rapidly becoming too late to ban ballistic missiles, just as it became too late to ban H-bombs."

6. Explain the basic theory of the proponents of disarmament as an exclusive approach to peace. If you do not agree with their theory, give reasons.

7. Discuss inspection as a part of arms control: its importance; kinds of; difficulties involved; degree of reliability needed, etc.

8. What do you think are the chances of Russian agreement to a workable arms control agreement? Defend your answer.

9. What is the "fourth (Nth) country problem"? Why is it called the "nightmare of the 'atomic three' foreign offices"? What is the connection between a nuclear-test ban and this problem?

10. What is "limited war"? How does it differ from "brush-fire war"? Do you think it is possible to arrive at a big power agreement to fight nothing but limited wars? Do you think the agreement would stand up in actual hostilities? Defend your answers. Why is the present Middle East imbroglio called a "case study in limited war"?

11. How does the missile-launching nuclear submarine affect the strategic situation?

12. Briefly describe two examples of "unfinished peace-work" to which the Humphrey subcommittee on disarmament might address itself in the future.

13. Do you favor the establishment of an international space agency? Defend answer.

14. "In formulating our defense and foreign policies, the weapons-revolution must receive continuing attention." Give reasons for statement, and at least two examples of the impact of the weapons-revolution on national policy.

15. What is your formula for achieving world peace, or at least a livable world?

BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS: RELATION TO DISARMAMENT

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, in preface to Staff Study No. 10: "Detection of and Inspection for Underground Nuclear Explosions," June 23, 1958)

In assessing the advantages and the disadvantages of an international agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests with inspection it is essential that we view such a step in the total perspective of national security, defense policy and foreign policy, including our goals for comprehensive control and reduction of armaments.

The arms race today is primarily a qualitative race. Each nation is attempting to develop the most destructive weapons, or the most precise weapons, or the weapons with the longest range, or weapons with some other special quality. The quantity of armaments is important, but it is the constant improvement in quality, or even the development of entirely new weapons, which causes a nation to expend some of its best resources and energies in an effort to keep up to date. It is for this reason that a suspension of nuclear weapons tests would constitute a meaningful disarmament measure.

A suspension of tests would greatly impede, if not prohibit, the development of new types of nuclear weapons. It would also prevent the development of nuclear weapons by any nation which has not already made the tests necessary to prove new weapons.

A suspension of tests would not, however, reduce the numbers of atomic and hydrogen bombs in the stockpiles of the United States and the Soviet Union. It would not prevent these stockpiles from being enlarged with

once, twice, and perhaps three times during this session of Congress. Some of the agricultural interests say, "If you do not dot every 'i' and cross every 't', just as we want it done, we will not let it pass." Some people have said, "You must do it this way or that way." They have said that it must be done this way or the other way and that it must be considered when they want it considered and under the parliamentary procedure they select, or they will not take action.

That is what is resulting in great damage to the farmer. I hope we can cure that situation before we leave. I thank my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. This is not a problem which affects only one State. It is not a problem which affects only a few people. The whole economy and the health of the economy of this Nation can be greatly impaired if we let our farmers sink into economic distress and let them stay there.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I know of the many days we have spent in the first 4 months of this year trying to get together on some farm legislation. We finally did so. What we finally agreed to do with the House was to hold the situation as it is for 1 more year. We passed that bill. It went to the President, and the President vetoed it.

Again we worked on the matter. Of course, the bill the Senate passed is not everything I wanted. However, if something is not done, let us consider where we will find ourselves. Let us consider cotton, for instance. Cotton acreage will be reduced about 23 percent, from 17,600,000 acres to approximately 14 million acres. The cotton farmers cannot stand such a reduction, particularly those who have a few acres at the present time. We must do something before Congress adjourns.

The Senate has done something. Therefore I urge the House to act and pass a bill, so that there can be a conference. We must save our farmers. We cannot afford to let 1,800,000 farmers leave their farms this year. That is what happened last year. If we do, the farmers of the Nation will be ruined. I do not believe that we will permit that to happen. I put the blame where the blame belongs. The blame belongs on Mr. Benson and the President of the United States.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I endorse everything the Senator from Arkansas has said about the cotton and rice programs. I am particularly interested in cotton, since not much rice is grown in North Carolina. But I am in sympathy with the rice program also.

Cotton is grown not only in Arkansas, but also in North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and other States. Cotton agriculture will be wrecked if Congress does not pass an adequate farm program.

I am doing everything I can, as I know the Senator from South Carolina is also, to urge my friends in the House to have action taken on a farm bill before ad-

journalment. I also am willing to stay here until a farm bill is passed.

I desired to add my endorsement to the efforts being made to enact a farm program at this session.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I strongly commend the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] with respect to the necessity and even the compulsion of enacting a farm program before Congress adjourns. Farm legislation must be passed before adjournment in order to provide desperately needed relief to the cotton farmers and to other farmers.

I, for one, will oppose and will not in any way support any resolution or movement for adjournment until such legislation has been passed.

REGULATION OF PRACTICE OF PHYSICAL THERAPY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the action of the Senate on Monday August 11, in passing S. 3843, a bill to regulate the practice of physical therapy by registered physical therapists in the District of Columbia. The measure was passed during the call of the calendar. I was absent from the Senate at the time and did not learn about the passage of the bill until yesterday. Therefore, not having voted, I am entitled to enter the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move also that a message be sent to the House to recall the bill, if it has already been transmitted to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1903) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, relating to travel expenses of civilian officers and employees assigned to duty posts outside the continental United States, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7125) to make technical changes in the Federal excise-tax laws, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. FORAND, Mr. REED, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania

were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. FORAND, Mr. REED, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed as managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 573. An act to provide for the licensing of persons engaged in budget planning in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3369. An act relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges;

H. R. 8470. An act to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with communications made by or to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the parties to such communications;

H. R. 8735. An act to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers retirement and annuity fund, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9020. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9121. An act to provide for the construction, equipping, and operation of a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 12292. An act to amend subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 294 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the assignment of retired judges to active duty;

H. R. 12963. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act;

H. R. 13272. An act to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define the term "organize" as used in that section;

H. R. 13311. An act to provide for the judicial review of orders of deportation;

H. R. 13558. An act to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, of combat wounded veterans who have been awarded the Purple Heart;

H. R. 13655. An act to further amend the act of August 7, 1940 (60 Stat. 896), as amended by the act of October 25, 1951 (65 Stat. 657), as amended by the act of September 4, 1957 (71 Stat. 610), to provide that the pregnant expenses of Sibley Memorial Hospital paid or incurred in connection with the hospital project either at the former American University site or the new Loughboro Road site be allowed as part of the total project cost provided that there be no increase in the amount of money already allocated or appropriated for such construction; and

H. R. 13673. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations, and for other purposes.

H. J. Res. 585. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on service to Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties from the Central Valley project, California; and

H. J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain real property in the District of Columbia for the proposed South-

west Freeway and for the redevelopment of the Southwest area in the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 573. An act to provide for the licensing of persons engaged in budget planning in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8470. An act to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with communications made by or to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the parties to such communications;

H. R. 8735. An act to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers retirement and annuity fund, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12963. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act;

H. R. 13655. An act to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended by the act of October 25, 1951 (65 Stat. 657), as amended by the act of September 4, 1957 (71 Stat. 610), to provide that the pregrant expenses of Sibley Memorial Hospital paid or incurred in connection with the hospital project either at the former American University site or the new Loughboro Road site be allowed as part of the total project cost provided that there be no increase in the amount of money already allocated or appropriated for such construction; and

H. J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain real property in the District of Columbia for the proposed Southwest Freeway and for the redevelopment of the Southwest area in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3369. An act relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges;

H. R. 12292. An act to amend subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 294 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the assignment of retired judges to active duty;

H. R. 13272. An act to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define the term "organize" as used in that section;

H. R. 13311. An act to provide for the judicial review of orders of deportation; and

H. R. 13558. An act to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, of combat-wounded veterans who have been awarded the Purple Heart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9121. An act to provide for the construction, equipping, and operation of a geophysical Institute in the Territory of Hawaii; and

H. J. Res. 585. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on service to Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties from the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 13673. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in January, February, and March of this year, our committee conducted hearings on Science and Education for the National Defense. These hearings were held on 22 different days, many of them running all day. The record of those hearings fills 1,602 pages.

A more illustrious cross section of the leaders of this country interested in education would be very difficult to assemble. They included, among others:

Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president of the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council.

Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, president of the California Institute of Technology.

Dr. I. I. Rabi, Higgins professor of physics at Columbia University, and past Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of Development Operations Division, Army Ballistic Missile Agency.

Dr. Morris Meister, principal of the Bronx High School of Science, New York City.

Dr. Edward Teller, physicist at the radiation laboratory of the University of California.

The import of the thinking of these witnesses cannot, of course, be readily condensed into a sentence or two. Many of them attacked our educational system for its glaring defects. Many of them defended it, notwithstanding certain problems. Some were more concerned with the problems of higher education and some, the gaps in the elementary and secondary grades.

There was one strain of thought running through the testimony of a majority of these people. It is this thought that most impressed me of all the many valuable ideas offered by the witnesses. It is the problem that most concerns me. It is briefly this: That the quality of our overall educational program is not as high as it should be, as it can be, and as it must be. Many witnesses thought that we are doing a better job than ever before in the history of man, in terms of the breadth of our educational efforts; that we are educating more people to a higher standard than any other country at any other time. But, across the board, the caliber of academic excellence can, and must, be improved.

This is particularly true among the exceptionally talented students—in secondary schools, in high schools, and in colleges and universities. We are losing many who are qualified for higher levels of learning; and of those who stay with our educational system, many are not stimulated and challenged to the levels of achievement of which they are capable.

The causes and effects of this problem of the lowered standards of education in this country are very difficult to assess and distinguish. There appears to be quite widespread agreement that underlying the whole problem are the developments of the modern education theories initiated by John Dewey and developed at the University of Columbia Teachers College. Certainly 1 person and 1 institution cannot be responsible for the whole problem, but this group appears to have contributed substantially. To the extent that they are responsible, it is

comforting to note that the educationists and the life-adjustment school are presently on the defensive. It is demonstrable that our students are not better adjusted than they were in the more traditional educational environment. This is evidenced by the size and seriousness of juvenile delinquency. They certainly are not better educated.

Time magazine in a special editorial in its March 31, 1958, issue stated that—

Thirty years of life-adjustment by the followers of Progressive Educator John Dewey have left United States education overadjusted, ill equipped to quicken intellectual life. Confident of their own established values and ethics, law, and culture, the old-fashioned teachers deliberately set out to pass down these values as part of a living tradition. They held it was all one cultural heritage—everything from Boyles' law to Cicero's first oration against Catiline—and the more you learned the wiser and more mentally alert you would be. Dewey and his disciples revolted against this certitude, which had indeed grown more than a little ossified in its teaching methods. But history records no better an example of throwing out the baby with the bath water. * * * The Deweyites thus transformed conditioning techniques into ends in themselves. Teachers colleges assumed the dignity of lameries; teachers spent more time learning methods and social adjustment. They had less chance of learning more about their subjects, in favor of compulsory educational courses and how to teach them. * * * The poor performance of their students has proved the educationists wrong. United States high-school students and graduates are ignorant of things grammar-school students would have known a generation ago, but perhaps are more aware of the world about them. But the strong basic rocks of knowledge to guide them through that world are absent. The years of barren discussion courses in English have made a whole generation chronically incoherent in the English language. * * * We need to do some thinking about the true ends of education. The worthwhile innovations and methods brought by Dewey's educationists should be kept, but their exclusive devotion to techniques and group adjustment should never again be allowed to hide the fact that American education exists first of all to educate the individual in a body of learning, with a tradition and purpose behind it.

One observable and distressing phenomenon is the unbalanced emphasis on athletics, extracurricular activities, and nonacademic course. This is, of course, related to the educationists' theories. The headmaster of St. Albans School in Washington, D. C., was recently quoted as saying:

Not until Americans pay as much honor to a school's mathematical team as to its athletic teams will the threat of Russian education diminish. * * * We need, not only in our schools but in our communities, enthusiasm for science, for languages, for learning that is comparable to the enthusiasm we have for sports.

Examples of this undue emphasis of nonacademic aspects of education are familiar to everyone.

I feel certain that all of friends who are interested in athletics will understand that I am not attacking them. I prize very highly my own participation in competitive sports and still derive tremendous enjoyment from watching the great football, basketball, and track teams of this country, and particularly at my alma mater, the University of

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237), the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Colorado. But, when we realize that the average college faculty salary in the United States is \$6,120, it comes as something of a jolt to read, as we did last December, that Michigan State's great football coach, Duffy Daugherty, was reported to have spurned a \$60,000 offer from Texas A. & M. to remain at Michigan State University at a salary close to \$20,000. In the December 12, 1957, issue of the Detroit Free Press, which carried the story of Mr. Daugherty's declined offer, there also appeared a cartoon entitled "That'll Be the Day." The cartoon depicted a white-coated professor entering the laboratory with a letter from which he reads to another professor bending over a flask in the laboratory: "Professor—Panhandle U offers you a cool \$60,000 a year to take over its science team."

The relation between coaches' salaries and those of the academic members of the faculty is not the most disturbing aspect of this imbalance. It is only a symptom. The problem which we must solve is the lack of emphasis and interest in education for its own sake, not only in our colleges, but in our high schools and grade schools.

In the field of science, this trend away from the academic rigors has produced a situation most alarming in terms of the national interest. In the high schools, where future scientists and engineers receive their first training in science and mathematics, the verified weaknesses can be illustrated by the fact that one-quarter of all American high schools offer no chemistry or physics. One-quarter offer no geometry. In many of the schools offering science and mathematics courses, the quality of instruction is low. According to a recent McGraw-Hill publication entitled "The Shortage of Scientists: What Caused It?":

Between 1950 and 1955, the number of graduating teachers qualified to teach high-school mathematics dropped 53 percent, and those qualified to teach science dropped 59 percent. Furthermore, only about 60 percent of the graduates certified to teach mathematics or science in 1955 entered teaching as a career.

This shortage, then, is one of the great problems. It is alarming—dangerous to the national welfare itself.

A brochure issued by the National Association of Manufacturers entitled "Tomorrow's Scientists and Engineers," states:

The shortage of scientists and engineers begins in our high schools and even in our elementary schools. Not enough boys and girls are entering these fields, largely because of a deficiency of trained science teachers.

This pamphlet also noted that—

The United States presently has an unfilled demand for 50,000 additional scientists and engineers. Further, we require 50,000 trained persons annually but are graduating only 40,000.

According to a January 1958, release of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, only 1 of 3 high-school students takes chemistry; 1 out of 4, physics; 1 out of 3, intermediate algebra; and 1 out of 8, trigonometry, or solid

geometry. Many pupils cannot study these subjects even if they want to.

The survey indicated that about 100,000 seniors were in public high schools where no advanced mathematics of any kind is offered. About 61,000 are in schools that offer neither chemistry nor physics. The report highlighted the same problem in different terms by pointing out that of the 4,592,000 children aged 16 and 17 in the United States, 2,776,000 were enrolled in the 11th and 12th grades of public high schools, but only 830,000, or 18 percent of all children, were studying science and only 659,000—14 percent of all children—were studying mathematics. Compare the fact that many of the United States high schools require only 5 hours of science a week for 1 year, with the fact that in the U. S. S. R. all secondary school students must study science for 7 hours a week during each of the last 4 years.

Another indication of the improper balance of our educational curriculums is in the field of foreign language. Marion Folsom, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said in January of this year that—

The United States is probably weaker in foreign language abilities than any other major country in the world.

I know of no one who has contested that statement. The student who graduates from college with a proficiency in any language other than English is the exception—not the rule—and we might well include English. It seems obvious that if we are to remain as leaders of the free world, it will be essential that we be able to talk to our friends from other countries, not in our language but in theirs.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is making such an excellent, informative speech that I hesitate to interrupt him, but I invite his attention to a report with which I am sure he is familiar, to the effect that a recent State Department study showed that only 1 out of 4 incoming Foreign Service officers had a proficiency in any other language than English. That shows what we are up against.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the Senator's interruption and his contribution. The evidence of the extent to which we are failing is almost colossal.

The foreign languages that are offered in the United States are studied by less than 15 percent of our high-school students and by not more than 15 percent of our college students. Many of our leading universities offer college degrees without any foreign language requirement. Half of our high schools, the smaller ones, offer no modern language training at all. The national supply of new high school teachers of foreign languages was 25 percent short of the demand in 1956. Of all the 1957 college graduates who have the qualifications for teaching in our public school system, only 1.4 percent had majored in a foreign language. Fewer than half of the Foreign Service officers accepted by

the Department of State had a practical speaking and reading knowledge of French, German, or Spanish, and only 25 percent of incoming Foreign Service officers have a proficiency in any foreign language.

There are some 35,000 United States citizens living as civilian employees of the United States Government overseas at the present time. There are an estimated 28,000 Americans who are affiliated with religious organizations serving overseas. About 22,000 are representing business firms and 15,000 are with international organizations. In one way or another there are approximately 102,000 Americans representing the United States overseas today, and this does not include the Armed Forces or tourists. According to the New York Times, there are in excess of 700,000 members of our Armed Forces outside the continental limits of the United States. Many of them have their families with them. There are, of course, hundreds of thousands of Americans who go abroad annually as tourists.

All of these people play an important part in the struggle for the hearts and minds of the people in these areas. Particularly the uncommitted areas of the Mideast, the Far East, and Africa. If we are to communicate to the people of these areas an understanding of our motives and purposes, it is obvious that we must be able to communicate with them in their own tongue.

The Soviet Union is making gigantic efforts along these lines, and we must reorient our educational system to provide greatly increased proficiency in foreign languages to meet their challenge.

The American people have in the past few years searched their souls diligently in an attempt to find out the secret of the Soviet propaganda campaign. Not the least of the great weapons in the hands of the Soviet Republic is the fact that its technicians and agents who visit other countries go to those countries with a knowledge of the languages of the countries. There are at least 2,000 separate dialects in South America. One American, Cam Townsend, has done something about converting these dialects to the written page so that their language will be available to those tribes and to the civilized world as well. In this month's issue of the Reader's Digest is a well-written article telling of the work of this man and his group. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for some reason, Americans have never understood that when we approach a person from Tunisia, from Ethiopia, from Sudan, from Ceylon—all countries which are bursting out on the threshold of the modern world, all with a high degree of illiteracy; all hungry for food, for adequate housing, for modern medicine; even more than this, all hungry for an opportunity to take what they believe is their rightful place among the family of nations—when we approach these

people with our wealth and, in addition, force them to speak to us in our tongue rather than theirs, we induce a mental block which cannot be overcome. They will excuse our efforts to speak their language, no matter how feeble, but they will not forget our arrogance in demanding that under all conditions they speak ours. How true this is, is being demonstrated daily by the Russians who do learn to speak their languages. In the United States there are not schools—there are not even textbooks—for most of these languages, so great is our own self-absorption and complacency. If we would win the great war, which is the war of ideas, we will have to devote ourselves first to learning the tongues of the undeclared nations who have just crossed the horizon into the family of nations.

In general, the American citizen is neither as well educated as we like to think he is, nor as well informed as he should be. The problem certainly goes beyond science, mathematics, and foreign languages. A terrifying illustration of how ill-equipped even our university graduates are is contained in a little pamphlet offered by the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University, entitled, *American Students Abroad: Good Will Ambassadors?* The Maxwell School queried a group of some 1,000 university-level Americans having a median age of 22 years, all of whom were en route to Europe. Their parents were mainly in the professional or upper business class of American society, and more than 80 percent came from families having income above the United States average. Syracuse University rated only 30 percent of them as satisfactorily equipped with a foreign language to handle a simple paragraph of translation properly. Only 37 percent were considered well-oriented with respect to Europe. Seventy-six percent, for example, could not name a single Italian novelist, poet, or painter. Fifty percent could not recall a single writer from Germany in the 19th or 20th century. Seventy percent of them could not name one country in which the state church was Lutheran. Even more alarming was Maxwell School's conclusion that only 36 percent were well-oriented concerning the United States. Thirty percent of their interviewees could think of no important 20th century novelist, and 50 percent could think of no American playwright, whom he might mention to foreign friends interested in the contemporary United States.

PROBLEM IN GENERAL

The principal problem, I repeat, is the quality of our education. This does not sum up all the weaknesses. There are many ramifications—some causes and some effects. An insufficient interest in the values of education is observable throughout our country. This has reflected itself in many places in lack of respect for teachers, schools and education generally. Inadequate faculty salaries, particularly college faculty salaries, have taken their toll. Some of our most competent people are consequently not attracted to the educational field as a

profession. This, in turn, further reduces the effectiveness of our educational efforts, *ad infinitum*.

A lack of awareness of the importance of education has led to allowing our physical education plants to be run down and neglected. This, again, diminishes the prestige of the profession, with consequent untoward results. Lack of interest on the part of many parents and leaders of the communities has allowed sloppy thinking to corrupt the curricula of our schools. All of these facets are interrelated and point to the quality of our educational system.

Lest any of my remarks be misinterpreted, let me hasten to say that I have no desire to say or to do anything which might be construed as an attempt to put the cat upon the back of American teachers. They are underpaid; they are not appreciated. After all, if deficiencies exist in our educational system, as I believe they do, it is the responsibility of each and every one of us—those sitting in the galleries of the Senate, those sitting upon the floor of the Senate, my own fellow townsmen, and my fellow citizens of Colorado—to make certain that our schools are what they should be. We cannot put that responsibility anywhere else except where it belongs, namely, right at home, upon the people who have the opportunity to run and direct our schools.

SOLUTIONS

That our educational effort stands in need of improvement is virtually unquestioned. I submit, and I believe that most parents in this country will agree, that the situation is in the nature of an emergency. What, then, can we do, both as a nation and as individual citizens?

I believe the cure lies primarily with the individuals in this country—the students, parents, teachers, business leaders, professional people, industrial executives, labor officials, and, of course, educators. Governments—local, State, or Federal—cannot do the job alone. In all our various capacities, we must take every possible step to improve the effectiveness of our educational institutions. This involves the assumption by each of us of the responsibility for the schools in our own communities. Most importantly, we must see that the curriculums of our schools serve the needs of our modern civilization. We must combine the tremendous newly acquired information on the techniques of teaching and learning with the tried and true values on the traditional academic discipline.

To do this, we must work to improve the prestige of the teaching profession, so that it will attract the most talented people. That will undoubtedly involve improving the monetary rewards of teaching; but it will also necessitate a change in the attitude of all of us toward our teachers. It will be necessary for us to help our present teachers to improve their effectiveness. It behooves us to see that an opportunity is available for all qualified students to continue their education to as high a level as possible. In order to have this accomplished, it will be necessary to improve our physical school plants and to recognize the necessity for making financial sacrifices.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

This brings us to the key question: What is the responsibility of the Federal Government in solving these educational problems?

Traditionally, the job of educating our children has been the responsibility of the State and local governments. I remain convinced that no cause has been shown for switching the primary responsibility to the Federal Government. For a true crash program to upgrade our educational system, it might be easier to have the Federal Government do it. However, in terms of our long-range objectives—a flexible, resourceful, expanding, and increasingly excellent educational system—our best chance lies with the historical concept: namely, that we retain State and local responsibility for education.

Because of what appears to be the present emergency and because of the unquestioned national interest in improving our educational system—in terms of our country's security and defense—it does not appear desirable for the Federal Government to take the leadership by extending assistance in certain areas. Without doing great harm to our long-range objectives, the Federal Government cannot make a frontal attack on the curricular standards of our schools. To do so, it is generally agreed, would be most hazardous. But, the Federal Government can, and I believe it should, do its part generally in producing in this country an atmosphere of increased attention and respect for the values of education. Because the national interest so clearly requires specific attention to the science, mathematics, and foreign-language areas, any Federal program must be oriented in that direction. Senate bill 4237, which I have been privileged to cosponsor, meets these objectives. The bill represents, for the most part, an improvement of Senate bill 3163, a measure which reflected the plans and direction the administration wished to take. I was also pleased to sponsor Senate bill 3163, earlier this year. Since the introduction of that bill, a variety of other bills have been introduced. In fact, the pending bill (S. 4237) contains some of the valuable suggestions contained in these other bills. But, for the most part, the pending bill is clearly the administration bill; and with certain reservations, Senate bill 4237 is supported by the administration and by President Eisenhower.

Much publicity has been focused on the scholarship section of the bill, leaving in the shadows the equally important loan program. Indeed, from the standpoint of encouraging children, who might not otherwise be able to afford to do so, to go to college, the loan section may very well be regarded as even more significant. Side by side, the two sections of the bill assume their proper stature.

SCHOLARSHIP SECTION

The scholarship section—title II—is the section which has received the most attention, although it is by no means the only significant portion of this bill. Its real purpose is to stimulate a genuine interest in academic attainments—to de-

velop a scholarly discipline in our youth—particularly in the fields of mathematics, sciences, and foreign languages. It will, of course, make it possible for a number of qualified children to secure a higher education.

Estimates of the number of existing scholarships run as high as 500,000; so it is clear that an additional 20,000 or 22,000 scholarships will not mean much in terms of the number of children involved. The real significance lies with the Federal leadership which this program represents. I have no doubt that other levels of government, as well as private individuals and organizations, will be stimulated by, and will respond to, this leadership.

The president of the California Institute of Technology, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, was one of the early witnesses in our committee hearings. In referring to the prospects afforded by the bill, he stated that—

This would be a tremendous stimulus to boys and girls all through high school to look to their curriculums, and to try to take more solid subjects, and to try to attain an intellectual competence during their high school years, so that they could win this prize. * * * It will be a great distinction in a particular high school to have several of its students win one of these Federal prizes.

The competition itself is one of the most valuable aspects of the scholarship program.

Dr. Edward Teller, who took a significant part in the development of our atomic capabilities, told our committee that—

It is extremely important that these scholarships be available because they will appear to the younger children as a goal. But the immediate situation of having won a competition would be a good addition to scholarships which should not be neglected.

The scholarship section provides—and, I believe, reasonably so—that a preference should be given to students who show outstanding ability and training in the fields of science, mathematics, or foreign languages. However, I want to make clear that this is not a restriction, merely a preference. The witnesses before our committee—I refer chiefly to the great scientists who testified at the committee's hearings—were almost unanimous in their belief that it would be inadvisable to limit the scholarship program to these areas. The scientists themselves seemed to be unanimous in the belief that if we succeed in attracting to our colleges a satisfactory number of capable students, undoubtedly a sufficient number will choose scientific fields of study.

LOAN PROGRAM

The student loan program authorized by title III of the bill should go a long way toward solving a very critical problem. It will help put us into a position where no qualified students who seek a college education will be unable to secure it for lack of money. The program is not noteworthy solely for the number of students who will avail themselves of it. It is perhaps more important in terms of leadership. A great number of our State and public colleges and universities have no loan programs at all. Experience

with this national-defense student-loan program will doubtless precipitate greater uses of this kind of program throughout the country.

It is rather generally agreed that many more able and qualified teachers will be required in the next few decades. The forgiveness provisions of the loan program, whereby borrowers will have their loan forgiven completely if they teach for a period of 5 years, should provide a substantial impact on the teacher shortage problem.

STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND LANGUAGE

A modest program of grants to States and to educational institutions to strengthen science, mathematics, and modern foreign-language teaching in our public elementary and secondary schools, is authorized by title IV of the bill. This program can help eliminate a serious defect in our educational system.

TEACHERS' INSTITUTES

Also aimed at the shortage of well-trained teachers are the general institutes authorized by title V. These institutes are designed to follow the pattern laid down by those conducted under the authority of the National Science Foundation. Testimony before our committee indicated the NSF institutes have been enthusiastically received by the teachers and have been extremely effective in assisting our teachers to gain high levels of competency.

FELLOWSHIPS

A program of fellowship calculated to reduce the crucial teacher shortage in the field of higher education is authorized by title VI of the bill. Correction of this established shortage is essential if our educational system is not to deteriorate further.

COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

Title VII of this bill will provide moderate grants to the States for improving our testing and counseling services. Such grants will help make available to students in our secondary schools the facts and counseling they need to assure their maximum intellectual development. In terms of money received, the taxpayers may well get more from this section than from any of the others. A number of witnesses before our committee indicated that a significant reason why we lose so many of our most capable students is that they do not receive the kind of encouragement which stimulates them to acquire a college education—particularly those children who come from families of lower income and lower educational backgrounds. It frequently happens that extremely intelligent and capable children fail to realize the extent of their own potentialities or even to consider the importance of going on to college. Many dismiss it as virtually impossible, without any awareness of the availability of scholarships and fellowships which, with some work on their part, would make it possible. I firmly believe that Federal leadership in this area will be productive and effective in terms of utilizing this Nation's most valuable asset—its young people—and permit each one to grow and to ex-

pand to the limit of his innate ability and individual interest.

RESEARCH IN TEACHING MEDIA

Another modest program authorized by the bill is the research and experimentation efforts provided for in title IX. The present material available excited the imaginations of our committee members with the possibilities, in terms of more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related mediums in the educational field. It seems entirely possible that real strides can be made here within the next few years. The potentialities of these research programs are great in terms of increasing the interest of children in education, and consequently motivating them more strongly; and also in terms of minimizing the very expensive problem of reducing faculty-student ratios. At the same time, we literally can burst beyond the limited vista of the classroom. Via TV, we can extend the realm of teaching to museums, the opera, stage, and research laboratories—all out-of-doors.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Extension of the well-proved vocational education program authorized by title X of the bill may well be desirable, but it is questionably appropriate in this bill. Inasmuch as this title has been restricted to scientific and technical areas—that is, the production of technicians—there is some justification. The section would be greatly improved if the restriction on "less than college grade" courses were removed. The talents and efforts of many of our scientists and engineers are being wasted in jobs which actually require only technicians. We have too long neglected this manpower area, and it is important that we proceed to stimulate the present programs of our junior colleges and technical institutes. It is possible that later today I may offer amendments designed to strengthen title X by making it more clearly a program for the production of technicians in the true sense of the word, leaving the development of skilled tradesmen to existing programs outside the scope of this legislation.

In conclusion, I want again to refer to the responsibility for leadership in strengthening our total educational system, which lies with the Federal Government. I believe that approval of this bill will provide that leadership, and that all segments of our country will respond to it.

As President Eisenhower said, at the time he submitted the first draft of this bill to the Congress:

Education best fulfills its high purpose when the responsibility for education is kept close to the people it serves. When it is rooted in the home, nurtured in the community, and sustained by a rich variety of public, private, and individual resources. Because of the national security interest in the quality and scope of our educational system in the years immediately ahead, however, the Federal Government must also undertake to play an emergency role.

I know that there will be those who will criticize this bill. Yet I believe that any person who will devote himself assiduously to the study of the needs in the field of education, particularly in the field at which this bill aims, will be as

convinced as the committee became convinced that the need is here, and the time for action is now, and it is not just a moderate need about which we talk. It is a need of which we must be fully cognizant. It is a need which we must fulfill if we are to serve our country and if, in fact, we are to preserve it in the strong position which it has traditionally occupied.

I earnestly urge the passage of the bill, Mr. President.

EXHIBIT 1

TWO THOUSAND TONGUES TO GO (By Clarence W. Hall)

(In the remote jungles of Latin America, living among primitive tribesmen for whom head-hunting is still a tempting recreation, is a group of extraordinary young Americans, many of them single girls. Members of the unique Summer Institute of Linguistics, their mission is twofold: to reduce to writing the numerous unwritten languages used by the jungle tribes, and through this means to bring literacy, civilization, and Christianity to Indians who have known little but want and savage superstition. Linked together only by radio and by their own jungle-hopping airline, these daring young pioneers daily confront dangers hazardous enough to blanch the most intrepid arm-chair adventurer.

(Almost half the world's population—some 700 million human beings—can still neither read nor write. Two Thousand Tongues To Go is the story of a man who could not help responding to that challenge, and of the remarkable, world-girdling campaign carried on by the gallant organization he created.)

When the boa constrictor struck, Loretta Anderson, a slight young woman from Paterson, N. J., was sitting alone in her dugout canoe beside an Indian settlement on the Morona River, deep in the Peruvian jungle. Her partner—Lila Wistrand, a trained nurse from Houston, Tex.—had just climbed the river bank to treat a sick child. Suddenly the giant reptile surged out of the water and lashed at Loretta. Screaming, fighting off the monster, Loretta managed to leap from the canoe, dripping blood from a badly gashed hand and arm. Lila came on the run, dressed her wounds—and an hour later both were back at work patiently teaching the Shapra Indians to read and write.

At about the same time, some 800 miles to the southeast, Esther Matteson of Oakland, Calif., and Annie Shaw of Alberta, Canada, fever ridden themselves, were battling an influenza epidemic that threatened to wipe out the Piro Indians. A couple of hundred miles northeast of them, Mary Ruth Wise of Lenoir City, Tenn., and Marth Duff of DeWitt, Ark., aboard a balsa raft loaded with Amuesha Indians, were fighting rapids and treacherous whirlpools on their way to their jungle school. And a bird's-eye view of the rest of Peru's 230,000 square miles of primeval wilderness would have revealed scores of other tiny jungle stations where other young Americans—42 of them unmarried girls of college age—were living dangerously among wild Indians. All for one purpose: to coax aborigines, whose languages have never before been reduced to writing, to learn the mysteries of "the paper that talks," the printed word.

These young Americans, and some 700 others like them, belong to one of the most determined and effective groups now waging war on world illiteracy: the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), otherwise known as the Wycliffe Bible Translators. Currently at work among 175 different language groups in 12 countries, SIL linguists have a transfiguring glory in their vision. Braving almost unbelievable hazards, they quietly spend their lives analyzing unwritten Indian

languages, creating primers and dictionaries, setting up schools and training native teachers.

The man who gives this group their vision is restless, 62-year-old William Cameron Townsend—"Uncle Cam" to his associates—who has spent more than 40 years among Latin America's Indian tribes. I learned about Townsend recently while hitching a ride across the Andes in a Peruvian military-transport plane. As we swept past a 21,000-foot snow-capped peak and began a long glide down toward the jungle, the young pilot removed the oxygen tube from his teeth and gestured toward the vast wilderness stretching out ahead farther than the eye could see. "Many young Norteamericanos are out there," he beamed. "You know Señor Townsend and his Instituto Linguistico?"

When I looked blank, his face expressed pity. "You should go and see," he said. "Peruvians are proud of what the Instituto does for our country."

During the next few days, penetrating deep into the jungle by tiny missionary plane and tipsy dugout canoe, I did go and see. In Indian villages dotted along the twisting jungle rivers I watched these amazing young Americans conquering, by Christian love, savage peoples whom neither time nor ancient Incas nor Spanish conquistadors had ever been able to conquer. And in their midst, spurring them on, was the remarkable man with the eager heart and the quick, boyish smile, whose dream had catapulted them into this audacious onslaught against ignorance and superstition.

Cam Townsend early developed his urge for spreading the Christian gospel. Back in 1917, when he was 21, he quit Occidental College in Los Angeles, packed a trunk with Spanish-language Bibles and headed for Guatemala. He soon found his Bibles a drug on the market. More than two-thirds of Guatemala's population were Indians; few knew Spanish, fewer still showed any hankering to learn.

One day an Indian to whom Cam had offered a copy of the Bible demanded, "Why, if your God is so smart, hasn't He learned our language?" Then and there, Townsend quit Bible distribution in favor of giving God another tongue.

For the next 15 years he lived with the primitive Cakchiquel tribe in Guatemala, eating their food (one diet item: toasted ants), mastering their difficult tongue, gradually reducing it to written form. Slowly and laboriously, he developed a simplified method for teaching any phonetically written language.

When finally in 1932, racked with tuberculosis, Townsend rode out again to civilization on a mule, he left the Cakchiquel Indians with five schools, a small hospital, a printing plant, scores of small churches, and hundreds of literate converts to Christianity. In Cam Townsend's soul was exultation; in his saddlebags was a printed copy, in the hitherto unwritten Cakchiquel language, of the entire New Testament.

Back in the States, while recovering from the TB, he was visited by an old missionary friend, Leonard Legters, who urged him to do for other Latin American Indians what he had done for the Cakchiquels.

Townsend thought it over, finally said, "O. K., Leonard, I'll tackle it. But on one condition: that you'll help me found a pioneer training camp where we can train mission candidates in primitive-language reduction and Bible translating. We're going to need a lot of help to do the job I have in mind."

As a starter, the two men waded into statistical tomes on illiteracy, and were astounded to find that almost half the world's adult population could neither read nor write. Even more astounding was the fact that there were in the world some 3,000

separate and distinct languages, more than 2,000 of them without any translations from the Bible at all.

"That's our goal," declared Cam. "Two thousand tongues to go."

In the summer of 1934, Townsend and Legters opened their school in an abandoned farmhouse in the Arkansas Ozarks. For the first session only two students showed up, but by its eighth summer the school had outgrown the farmhouse—and a renovated chicken coop used for sleeping quarters—and moved to the campus of the University of Oklahoma.

Incorporated as the Summer Institute of Linguistics, this unique school now teaches language analysis to some 500 students annually at the Universities of Oklahoma, North Dakota and Washington, has branches in England, Canada and Australia. Graduates to date number more than 4,000, are at work in 25 countries under mission boards of 35 denominations, both Protestant and Catholic.

But before being whooshed into SIL's wilderness orbit, the student linguists are put through the wringer during 3 months of rugged survival tests at a jungle training camp. Here both men and women must prove themselves able to handcraft their own jungle huts without saw, hammer or nails (they use wild cane poles and leaves); make balsa rafts and handle dugout canoes through raging rapids and crocodile-infested rivers; cope with wild animals and giant reptiles; administer first aid for everything from broken bones to epidemics; and find their way on 25-mile hikes through unmarked forests, living off the jungle. Those who pass these rigorous tests—more than 90 percent—are then sent out for 3 months of living with test tribes.

As soon as he had trained a few in his linguistic methods, Townsend and his students headed for Mexico. They were stopped at the border, bluntly told, "We don't want translators. The Indian languages must disappear." Townsend retorted, "They disappear more rapidly if you use the Indians' languages to teach them Spanish."

With help from two noted Mexicans, educator Moisés Sáenz and Dr. Mariano Silva y Aceves, a linguist, he wormed his way in, settled among the Aztecs in the State of Morelos, started on the long job of learning the language. Today, with the full cooperation of the government, there are in Mexico 216 SIL translators, working among 51 backward tribes. "We don't look upon you as foreigners any more," a high government official said recently. "You're real Mexicans."

Typical of Townsend's dedicated workers is Marianna Slocum of Ardmore, Pa. Marianna and her fiancé studied at SIL, preparing to go together to the Tzeltals, a tribe numbering some 40,000 in the state of Chiapas. When her fiancé died just before the wedding date, Marianna insisted on following their gleam alone.

"My family was horrified," she says. "But they came around."

After mastering the complicated language Marianna prepared school texts, started reading and writing classes and—in 16 years—founded 7 thriving bilingual schools, translated into Tzeltal a raft of books and pamphlets introducing the tribesmen to the Mexican national culture. Along the way, she managed to banish witchcraft, thievery and drunkenness from large sections of the tribe, replace witch doctors' nostrums with modern medicine and convert 5,000 Tzeltals from sun worship to Christianity.

Last December, as Marianna, packed up to move on to another dialect, a leading Mexican magazine, *Tiempo*, made her the subject of a 16-column cover story that proclaimed her "the architect of a transformed

situation." She had lifted an entire Indian nation "from barbarism to civilization."

Meanwhile, word of SIL's achievements in Mexico was spreading to other Latin-American countries. Peru was first to respond to Cam Townsend's offer of trained linguists.

In the summer of 1945, at the invitation of President Manuel Prado, Townsend spent months surveying the Peruvian jungle, visiting tribal headmen, sounding out their willingness. Then he brought in workers for three of the most remote tribes. To get to them, the young North Americans had to travel for weeks by canoe and raft, beat their way through almost impenetrable jungle, detour around tribes noted for killing white men on sight.

This harrowing experience convinced Townsend of one thing: "We've got to have a plane." A United States marine mission at Lima was about to scrap an old Grumman amphibian. The Peruvian Government, with a generous assist from a Townsend admirer in California, bought it for him, and to fly it Townsend recruited Larry Montgomery, a former Air Force combat flier. Today Montgomery is superintendent of JAARS (Jungle Aviation and Radio Service), SIL's air arm.

JAARS now has a fleet of 19 planes, 21 pilots, plus crews of maintenance men and skilled radio technicians. Most of the aircraft are equipped with pontoons for river landings. Pride of the fleet is the Hello Courier, a lately developed stallproof, spin-proof all-metal plane that can take off or land in 75 yards at only 30 miles per hour when fully loaded, cruise at 160 miles per hour, and as high as 23,000 feet, turn in a small radius at low speeds and, using an ingenious winch, can hoist a man out of the jungle while flying a tight circle close to the ground.

Last year Townsend's daring pilots flew more than a million and a half air miles over the green hell of Peru's Amazonia without a single injury to any passenger or crewman. Daily they put their planes down safely on postage-stamp landing strips gashed out of the jungle or make tricky river landings on crocodile-infested waters. As Omer Bondurant, 35-year-old veteran of a World War II night-fighter squadron, told me, "We do our best, then leave the rest to God."

When Townsend is not gadding about the world scouting out hitherto unreached Indian tribes, recruiting college youths, selling governments on his literacy program, he is at home at Yarinacocha, the staging area for SIL's Operation Peru. A 400-acre slash in the jungle, this base is a humming beehive of actively devoted to one end: the servicing and supplying of the young linguists who are currently at work among 29 of Peru's 45 different tribal groups, each with its own distinct language, customs—and jeopardies.

Catch him at home and Townsend will take you through the big base sprawled out along the shores of Lake Yarina. Here are the hangars, repair shops and airstrips for his air force. Here, too, are the jungle-style residences for 175 workers and their families; a medical clinic; commissary; cafeteria and dormitories for tribal workers constantly passing in and out; a printing shop where tribal primers, dictionaries and other reading materials are manufactured—some 18,000 volumes last year. Here, also, are classrooms where Indians brought in from their tribes may be given advanced training under Ministry of Education supervision, taught Spanish, then returned as teachers of their own people in newly established government schools.

Nerve center of the jungle base is Radio Central, a control tower manned day and night to keep contact with linguists out among the tribes. Townsend has bought,

scrounged or had given him enough war-surplus radio sets to bind his whole far-reaching jungle program into a radio network.

Dramatic incidents proving the network's value occur with alarming frequency. There was, for example, the time when an SIL team used its transmitter to quash a tribal war in the making. While among the Cashinahuas (known as the "Bat People"), Eugene Scott and Kenneth Kensinger found their tribe seething one day with war preparations. The Cashinahuas had just heard a rumor that one of their men, who had married into the neighboring Culina Tribe, had been the victim of a witchcraft slaying by his in-laws. Brandishing spears and bows and arrows, they shouted, "Death to all Culinas."

"How do you know the rumor is true?" Scott asked the Indians. "Come, let's check."

Mystified, the warriors crowded around the transmitter while a call was put through to an SIL team living with the Culinas. In a matter of minutes the voice of the "murdered" man, 100 miles distant, was reassuring his kinsmen: he was not only alive but was being treated well by "our friends the Culinas." The warriors dropped their weapons. Their chief asked to speak to his Culina opposite number, invited the Culinas to a big feast. Three days later what might have been a bloody battle was turned into an intertribal whoopla for peace.

Linguists in the jungles are required to make radio contact regularly; if they are "off the air" too long, a plane is dispatched to discover why. A staff of radio technicians circulates regularly among the stations to see that transmitters and receivers are in top condition.

On occasion the radio tower at Yarinacocha knits SIL's whole sprawling operation into a network of prayer. The operator on duty may alert the entire network as follows: "For the next hour Pilot George Insley will be over jungle area where he cannot land. * * * Wes and Eva Thiesen report their Indians threatened with flash floods. * * * Uncle Cam leaving today to address college groups in States, seeking new workers. * * * Pilot Don Smith forced down on river, engine trouble. All request your prayers. That is all."

The girl linguists—the "dedicated daughters of Uncle Cam," as they call themselves—go out into these incredibly dangerous places as casually and eagerly as their sisters at home explore a shopping center. And they seem to make out better than the men—probably because the Indians are less suspicious of them. As Dr. Townsend says, "The Indian chiefs think, 'They're only women. What harm can they do? Like as not they're looking for husbands.'"

Townsend was at first skittish about sending girls into unpredictable tribal situations alone. But he was shamed into it when, several years ago, two volunteers demanded, "You say that God takes care of His own. Doesn't that include us?"

He let them go. "And of course God honored their faith," he says. "He has taken perfect care of them."

In all Peru I found no better example of this care—or of the amazing courage of SIL's girl linguists—than Loretta Anderson, pioneer among the Shapra tribe.

Eight years ago the Shapras, vicious killers and headhunters, were among the most feared of Peruvian tribes. Their chief, Tariri, had attained leadership by the simple device of slaying his predecessor in cold blood, then daring any warrior to dispute his authority. Then one day in 1950 Loretta, with her first coworker, Doris Cox, paddled up to his village in a dugout canoe. Climbing the river bank, between rows of glowering tribesmen momentarily immobilized by such audacity, the two slender white girls

faced the chief. Using a few Shapra words picked up from a trade downriver, plus sign language, they told him they had come to live among his people and study their language.

Tariri stared at the two girls in a long silence. Then he crisply ordered that they be assigned a hut, with a couple of older Indian women to help them with whatever they were after. Years later he confided to Townsend, "If you had sent men, we would have killed them on sight. Or if a couple, I'd have killed the man and taken the woman for myself. But what could a great chief do with two harmless girls who insisted on calling him brother?"

The jungle surrounding their hut had its beauty; clouds of lavishly colored butterflies fluttering through shafts of brilliant sunshine that pierced the foliage when the rains stopped; gaudy toucans, macaws, and umbrella birds swooping through the trees. It also had its sinister sounds. At night, from the dripping forest, came the cries of howler monkeys and the jaguar's coughing roar.

Most discomfiting were the hordes of flying and crawling things: gnats that swarmed about them by day; the ants and cockroaches that came out of every crevice of their hut, the big spiders that crawled over their bed nets at night.

"We were scared most of the time during the first 5 months," Doris and Loretta will tell you. "But when we trembled the most we prayed the hardest."

They prayed hard one night when, while they were working over their notes by candlelight, an Indian woman burst in with alarming news. The men of the tribe, winding up a drunken feast, were even now reeling down the path to the hut, loudly proclaiming their intention to rape the white girls. "You must hide."

The girls fled to the forest, spent the night there. Next morning, returning to their radio transmitter, they called Yarinacocha, 400 miles away.

"Bring Tariri to the radio," said the base director.

The chief, who understood Spanish, heard a stern voice coming from the black box. It said, "You are the chief—and you can't control your tribe?"

His authority challenged, Tariri drew himself up with solemn dignity. "I am the chief," he said. "I promise that the senioritas will not be harmed."

And they weren't, then or later.

Amid such harassments, Loretta and Doris buckled down to the agonizingly slow job of learning the language, desperately trying to distinguish one sound from another in the exotic jargon that swirled about them. After several months the white girls' persistence, plus their many kindly acts, melted the Shapras' suspicions. Flattered by the girls' earnest attempts to master their language, the Indians readily gave them words for objects pointed at, and the language notebooks began to fill up with Shapra words and phrases. As soon as they had a phonetic alphabet worked out, Doris and Loretta began the long task of producing primers, teaching Shapra children to read and write. Along with Shapra folk stories and legends, they translated a few verses from the Bible.

Abruptly one day Chief Tariri joined a little group the girls were teaching. He stood, frowning, as the lesson went on. After hearing the first Scripture verse translated into his own language, he broke in to ask that it be repeated again and again. Finally he exclaimed, "My heart understands with a leap."

To Doris and Loretta he said, "When you came, I did not understand why. Now I know. What you are doing makes my people happier and better able to care for themselves."

Thereafter the chief appeared regularly at the girls' hut, would sit for hours helping them get the exact meanings of words, write down tribal stories, translate more Bible verses. And as he did so, Tariri began to show signs of subtle change. One day in 1953, 3 years after the girls had come to his village, he called his Shapras together for a dramatic announcement.

"I like this white girls' God," he said. "He has brought us many good things. I'm going to stop worshipping the boa."

In the following months, Doris and Loretta were convinced that Tariri was indeed changed. Not only did he put aside snake worship, but, one by one, without being asked to, he shrugged off witch-doctor practices, outlawed murder, abolished head shrinking.

In 1955, when Townsend arranged a celebration of SIL's 10th anniversary in Peru, he took Tariri with him to Lima. With Loretta translating for him, Tariri talked unabashedly with Peru's President, newspaper editors, groups of schoolchildren. Every inch a chief, even in the white man's jungle, he held his head high, told Loretta, "Speak up, leave out nothing I say."

Two years later, in June 1957, Townsend arranged for Tariri and Loretta to go to Hollywood to appear on Ralph Edwards' "This Is Your Life" TV show. The program featured Rachel Saint, an SIL translator who had helped Loretta briefly with the Shapras but who is now writing the language of the Aucas, savage slayers of her brother, Nate Saint, and four other young missionaries.¹ Tariri caught the fancy of viewers: Millions will remember how he stood proudly self-possessed, stared boldly into the camera's eye, and testified with simple dignity to his new-found faith.

The quality of Tariri's commitment to Christian precepts underwent a fiery test when, returning to his jungle fastness, he was attacked by an enemy group. He was shot through the chest, and others of his Shapras were slain. Jungle law called for bloody reprisal, but Tariri's faith was strong. He issued an order for his revenge-hungry Shapras to simmer down, called the girls to him, and said, "Read, please, where God says, 'Return not evil for evil.'"

Today there are a number of Shapra schools going, with primers and other teaching tools in the Shapra language. Young tribesmen now in training will shortly become qualified teachers. Nearly 100 Shapras have followed Tariri in accepting Christianity. The Gospel of Mark, in the Shapra tongue, is completed and ready for printing. Still, the work is far from done. Another 5 to 7 years must be spent with the Shapras before the girls can move on to another tribe and another long battle with a new tongue.

"It's not easy," says Loretta Anderson. "But it's a lot of fun. And how rewarding."

I discovered this same attitude among every SIL linguist group I met. Hardest pressed are those who work with tribes whose languages are multi-tonal. In one such tribe the words for "sinner" and "fat person" are the same; the tone used spells the difference. One day, teaching that "God loves the sinner," the worker saw bewilderment on his Indians' faces. To his dismay he discovered he had been asserting that "God loves the fat person." Since few in the tribe were fat, he was "shutting out a lot of them from divine favor." He quickly shifted to the right tone.

But the SIL people have to sandwich their linguistic work in between treating countless ills. For, in dispatching a pair of workers into the jungle, Townsend likes to have one of them a trained nurse, and both must be prepared to cope with the health emergencies which arise in dismaying abundance.

Pneumonia is rife—and deadly. Common, too, are elephantiasis, yaws, and an ulcerating disease called leishmaniasis which, transmitted by a sand fly, destroys nose and throat passages and brings death from starvation.

I found a good example of the linguist-nurse in Jeannie Grover, a serene, brown-eyed girl from Pateros, Wash. Jeannie's tribe is the Aguarunas, a branch of the head-hunting Jivaros, largest Indian grouping (10,000) in Peru's Amazon basin. Among them Jeannie and her partner, Millie Larson from Solway, Minn., have established 11 bilingual schools. In one-room, thatched-roofed schoolhouses scattered over the jungle-covered hills, some 600 little boys and girls are taught by Aguaruna men who, a few years ago, could not read or write their own language but who are now proficient in both it and Spanish. In June 1956 the 11 teachers from these schools went to the polls to vote in the Peruvian elections—for the first time in Aguaruna history.

Jeannie's and Millie's hut is in a tiny patch of clearing, edged on one side by the tumbling Marañon River, on three others by dense jungle. When not off fighting their enemies, Aguaruna men mill about the clearing, fondling their blowguns and poison-tipped darts, laughing and talking. I commented that the Aguarunas, with their reputation as murderous head-shrinkers, looked pretty formidable—these barrel-chested bronze men in short skirts, erect, and proud of visage, their upper bodies daubed with red paint and decorated with beetle wings and toucan feathers. Jeannie laughed merrily. "They looked so to me, at first. Now they're the most beautiful people on earth."

Every day some 30 Indians come to her hut for first aid or medical treatment. To reach other patients she must tramp through the dripping forests, a banana leaf over her head for an umbrella, her medical kit in hand, or travel by dugout canoe up the turbulent river.

Does she feel no fear? "Only one—that same day, when we need it most, we'll run out of medicine."

That fear was justified when, not long ago, Jeannie's Aguarunas came down with 200 cases of whooping cough, exhausting her stock of remedies. But a radio message to Yarinacocha brought swift answer. The doctor there loaded a plane with medicines, flew to Jeannie's aid and, after 10 days of furious labors up and down the Marañon, had the epidemic stopped in its tracks.

"Before Millie and I came," Jeannie told me, "the witch doctor was in sole charge of the Aguarunas' health. When confronting a patient, he first fortifies himself with a long drink of potent ayahuasca. Then, alternating drinks with puffs on his pipe, he sucks on the surface of the sick area—often until the blood comes—and spits on the ground. Next he does a wild dance around the victim, cursing at the spot where he spat. When the ayahuasca takes hold, he falls to the ground. Anyone whose face shows up in his drunken dream is declared to be the black-magic worker who caused the sickness, and the alleged culprit is promptly banished, or killed if the patient dies."

"Nowadays," says Jeannie, "I'm afraid we are doing him out of a job." The witch doctor still goes through his shenanigans, but with less authority and fewer patients. In fact, not long ago when his own daughter fell ill he brought her in his arms to beg for a hypo injection and suifa salve for the sores covering the little body. "White man's sickness," he grunted—and turned his daughter over to Jeannie.

The base clinic at Yarinacocha, started in 1949 by Dr. Kenneth Altig with a second-hand doctor's kit and a batch of donated medicines, now boasts a 12-room building, up-to-date laboratory equipment including X-ray, and serves 10,000 patients annually.

Its medical stores are supplied partly by the Peruvian public health service, partly by friendly pharmaceutical houses in the States.

In charge of the always-crowded clinic is Dr. Ralph Eichenberger, the busiest and most resourceful medical director I have ever met. With only a skeleton nursing staff (I have trouble keeping nurses—they all want to go out into the tribes) he manages a round-the-clock program of healing that must surely be unique. Besides doctoring patients flown in from the jungles, he keeps in touch with the linguist-nurses by radio, and stands ready, at a moment's notice to take off into the wilderness to meet emergencies.

Dr. Eichenberger likens his work to that of a city's public health service. "The only difference," he says, "is that our city covers a quarter-million square miles, our visiting nurses are hundreds of jungle miles apart, our consultation is by radio, our ambulances are balsa rafts and jungle-hopping planes." Covering this circuit, containing 130,000 disease-prone tribespeople, takes some doing.

Since 1954, when many lepers were found living along the Ucayali River, Drs. Eichenberger and Altig have conducted monthly leper flights. On these rounds they stop at dozens of little villages, or meet in pre-arranged spots along the river those who have been banished from their tribes. The sufferers paddle out to the pontooned plane in canoes from their jungle hideouts, lift their disfigured faces and hands in mute appeal. During the last 4 years hundreds of Indians, their leprosy arrested, have been returned to their tribes.

SIL's linguist-nurses must necessarily perform medical services far beyond the portfolio of the average graduate nurse. But when they have a complicated case, they call Dr. Eichenberger. This tireless, devoted man at his radio, his calm voice reaching out across huge distances to prescribe treatment, provides a picture whose drama is lost only on himself.

For example, when his radio crackled out the news that a young Piro Indian girl had suffered a compound fracture of her elbow that resisted the usual setting, he called for an exact description of the break, told the nurse how to rig up rocks for weights to pull the shattered bones back into place and how to apply tree branches for splints. Ten days later, visiting the tribe on his regular rounds, he found that the break was healing perfectly.

When a worker with the Huambisa Tribe frantically called in to report a mother dying in complicated childbirth, Eichenberger crisply ordered: "Take your radio into the woman's hut. Leave your receiver turned on. Do exactly what I tell you." With his instructions, the birth was successfully accomplished. Both mother and baby lived. Hours later, the worker called back: "Hear that racket, Doc? The whole tribe's celebrating. They say you're the greatest witch doctor that ever lived."

How do the SIL workers make these Amazonian Indians want to learn? Says Townsend, "We trade upon three facets in their mentality that are common to almost all primitives: their pride in their own language, their eagerness to better themselves economically, their insatiable curiosity."

It is Townsend's theory that "Jungle Indians are the most curious people alive. Only the fear of other tribes, plus generations of mistreatment by the only outsiders they've met—rubber workers, gold seekers, adventurers—has prevented them from learning about ideas, people, happenings in the mysterious world beyond their green-walled prison."

Out in the jungle I saw his theory validated again and again. In one tribe I watched a linguist with a young beginner.

¹ See *Through Gates of Splendor*, the Reader's Digest, August 1956.

She pointed to a symbol she had created for the word "tree," let the youngster observe it for several minutes. Then she flipped to a page with this symbol among dozens of others. "Now find the tree," she said. The boy's eager eyes searched the page. Then, suddenly, his brown finger stabbed at one symbol and his face lighted up as he said, "Teacher, I'm reading."

"Once they discover reading is possible," she told me, "there's no stopping them."

The advantage of learning a second language—Spanish, in the case of Peru—also quickly becomes apparent to jungle Indians. Especially to those who have dealings with itinerant traders and patronos who settle near their borders, establish trading posts, supply them with trinkets in exchange for Indian goods—and often exploit their ignorance by bilking them. It was this kind of situation, Townsend told me, that impelled Chief Shironkama of the Machiguengas to seek education for his people. Throughout Peru's Amazonia, Shironkama is acknowledged as one of the most powerful and, until recently, one of the most feared of tribal headmen. Today he and many of his formerly savage warriors are striking examples of the changes that SIL workers can bring about in a few years of concentrated effort.

To get Shironkama's story firsthand, I took off one day from Yarinacocha for the far Urubamba River. Our pontoon-equipped Cessna, flown by JAARS pilot Don Weber, soared for hours over thick jungle broken only by occasional twisting rivers. Suddenly, far below, we saw one of the villages of Shironkama's domain.

Coming down low over the river, Weber muttered, "It's in flood. Look at that clutter." I glanced down—and was all for turning back. The river was a raging torrent, filled with logs. Weber calmly moved his stick and grinned. "Ever hear of coming in on a wing and a prayer?"

Seconds later we splashed to a landing and Weber maneuvered us toward the shore, skillfully dodging the drifting debris. As the pontoons nudged the muddy bank, he leaped from the cockpit and flung a rope to some excited Indians who quickly secured the plane to a tree.

Atop the bank stood a solitary figure, clothed from neck to ankle in a hand-woven cushma, the peculiar sacklike garment of the Machiguengas. This was Chief Shironkama, former "terror of the Urubamba." He gravely greeted us, was joined almost immediately by a handsome young man in a jungle helmet—Wayne Snell, SIL linguist from Elgin, Ill. Standing together on that lonely bank, the two made a striking picture.

A gunner's mate during World War II, Wayne told me his call to missionary service had come when he met, on island after island in the South Pacific, black men who, instead of the raw savages he'd expected, "were better Christians than I was." They had been made so, he learned, by Christian missions. The war over, he took the SIL course, and volunteered for duty in Peru.

Since 1952, Wayne and his wife Betty have established a number of bilingual schools among the hitherto unreached Machiguengas; created textbooks on reading and writing, arithmetic, farming, health and hygiene; persuaded the prone-to-wander Indians to settle around the schools (initiating an agricultural program aimed at making it profitable to do so); and translated several portions of the Bible. To top it all, they have made a practicing Christian out of Shironkama.

Since his conversion 3 years ago, the chief's rigid rule for his large tribe has been: "No more killings; no more drunken feasts; no more raids on other tribes for women." Shironkama settled his own woman question by dismissing (with pensions) his plurality of wives, asked Snell for legal marriage with the one he chose to keep.

The Snells' first contact with the chief was dramatic. They had scarcely settled in their native hut when their village, a day's canoe trip from Shironkama's, was raided. The chief, whose supply of wives was running low, had staged the raid to replenish his stock. When he and his warriors surged up to the Snells' hut, Shironkama stared in disbelief at the white couple, held his warriors back while listening to their reason for being there, then abruptly turned on his heel and left, cryptically grunting, "I'll see you later."

One day shortly thereafter Shironkama reappeared, this time trailed by a group of children he had rounded up from several Machiguenga villages. To Snell he said, "You make school, yes?"

Only later did the Snells learn why Shironkama wanted education for his people. For years his Machiguengas had been victims of a white patron who cheated them blind in trades, worked them for such pittance pay as one fishhook for a whole barrel of rice, indentured them with debt. When the Machiguengas, weary of such treatment, began staying away, the patron called in Shironkama, told him he would have to force his people to work out their debts, gave the chief a gun, saying, "If they won't work, shoot them." The chief took the gun, shot two of the patron's henchmen instead. "The patron will not make you his slaves again," he told his people. "You are free."

Chief Shironkama told me, with Snell interpreting: "From such white men as the patron I learned that men who had power read books. I reasoned that, if one is to avoid being cheated or enslaved, he, too, must have the knowledge that books give. I wanted that knowledge for myself and my people."

The next morning before dawn I was bonged awake by someone beating on a hollow log. It was the bell announcing school's start an hour later. The Indians were already assembled outside the one-room schoolhouse; they'd been up, I found, since 3:30.

Chief Shironkama was herding the students, ranging from very small to near manhood, into the building whose thatched roof was still dripping from the night's torrential rains. When they were all in, the rough benches behind rude desks filled, Shironkama himself sat on the floor, leaning against the bamboo pole wall.

School began with a Bible reading. The lesson dealt with John the Baptist's manful defiance of Herod. As it was explained in fluent Machiguenga, I watched the chief's face. It was alight with understanding. With every point Snell made, Shironkama nodded thoughtfully, and from his throat came the murmuring assent, "Mmm-mmm-mmm."

Instruction was then taken over by a young Indian named Mario, whom the Snells had carefully developed into teacher and village-Christian leader. While Mario's voice droned on, the chief's sharp eyes searched the faces of the students to see if they were listening. They were—intently.

These students, Mario told me later, wanted to have classes all day. They scorned recesses, barely taking time out to eat. At dismissal of school they gathered in small groups to compete in display of their new knowledge. I noticed one youngster, about 14, saunter off to the river bank, a primer under his arm. He seated himself on a log and loudly began to read. His pose was one of elaborate indifference to the kids who came to catch the performance. But, behind the lifted book, I saw his eyes dart up from the page now and then to note his erudition's effect on his awestruck audience.

The scene was, in a way, comical; in another, strangely pathetic. I turned away, feeling not a laugh but a catch in the throat.

"Of all a linguist's tasks," says Cam Townsend, "Bible translation is the trickiest. It

must be preceded not only by proficiency with the language, but an intimate knowledge of a tribe's customs and taboos as well. Figures of speech that may be meaningful to one brought up in the Anglo-American tradition are often mystifying boobytraps to a primitive man's understanding."

Some Biblical similes, literally translated, can convey lethal suggestion. For example, one linguist living with tribesmen who had a penchant for burning their enemies be thought himself in time to avoid recommending that they "heap coals of fire on his head." He translated it instead, "Make him ashamed by your friendliness."

Suggestions from the Indians themselves often help to make the wording clearer than in the English Bible. When a tribe was getting nothing from Christ's warning, "If any man offend one of these my little ones * * *" the translator took an Indian's tip and put the onus on "any man who shows one of these my little ones the wrong path." In another tribal language the same passage is rendered, "If anyone spoils the heart of one of these my little ones."

Townsend insists that the great doctrines "must be explained in living, understandable words." Abstract terms are always tough. In some tribes "God's love" is too weak; one tribe describes divine compassion thus: "God hurts in His heart for us." To the Piro's such words as "faith" and "believe" are incomplete by themselves; they insist that "believing in God" must also denote action; so they make it "to obey-believe." For the Shipibó's "doubt" is described as "thinking two things"; "pride" means "I outrank others." The same tribe makes a covetous person "one who has gone crazy for things." The Piro's equate "peace" with "the well-arranged soul." For another tribe the phrase, "Our hope is in God," is translated, "We hang onto God."

To Townsend such translations are "an improvement not only for jungle Indians but possibly for modern Americans as well."

After developing a passage as best he can, the linguist tries it out on his tribe, submits it to long discussion, revises it over and over again until the Indians' reaction indicates crystal-clear understanding.

"A single book of the Bible may take years to translate satisfactorily," says Townsend.

The government school for training has become one of the most important activities at Yarinacocha. It got its start some years ago when Townsend took Peruvian educators on a tour of his jungle schools that were being taught by Indians groomed for the job by the linguists. The educators were amazed. "You've laid the groundwork for a whole educational program," they said.

The result: in 1953 the Ministry of Education set up its Curso de Capacitación Pedagógica at Yarinacocha. Since then, during the first 3 months of each year, promising tribesmen have been brought in for intensive courses in Spanish, advanced academic subjects, teaching methods. Accredited, they return to their tribes as government-paid teachers and hoist over their jungle schoolhouses the official crest of the Ministry of Education.

This year 75 teacher candidates took the course. Bringing their families with them, many traveled for days by canoe and raft to reach the base, while others came on the institute's planes. They represented 16 different tribes—"a sort of jungle version of the United Nations," Townsend calls them. While I was at Yarinacocha, someone pointed out a chummy pair of teacher candidates comparing notes and laughing together. "They belong to tribes that have been mortal enemies for generations," said my informant. "Had they met in the jungle a few years ago, they'd have killed each other on sight."

Dr. Morote Best, a brilliant educator, said to me, "Until only a short while ago, nobody

could convince me that jungle Indians could learn. Then one day I came upon a pair of these young girl linguists. I could scarcely believe my eyes when I saw their crowded little school, found boys studying books by firelight, older people struggling to learn to read and write. I said to myself, "There is hope for our Indians."

Returning to Lima, he gave a glowing account of what he'd seen. "These young North Americans" he said, "are showing us how to cut through the wilderness of ignorance, helping to bring our aborigines into the life of our country. They deserve help."

In January 1957 Dr. Morote was appointed by the ministry of education as supervisor of the jungle schools, now has his own thatched house at SIL's jungle base, spends much of his time on inspection swings through the jungles. He shares Cam Townsend's conviction that "the newly educated Indian cannot subsist on his former economy of fishing and hunting. Until recently a semi-nomad, moving from place to place in search of new hunting and fishing grounds, he has been shown the advantages of settling in permanent villages, where his children can go to school and he can make a better life for himself."

To help jungle Indians realize that better life, the Peruvian government has launched a brand-new program to teach modern agricultural methods to the tribes. On land adjoining the SIL base, 250 acres have been set aside where Indian teacher trainees can study agriculture under trained SIL agronomists. To date, 21 teachers have taken the agriculture course, now are showing their fellow tribesmen how to market their products.

Townsend's aim of "not taking the Indian out of the jungle but taking the jungle out of the Indian" sounds good—to all save those with romantic notions about primitive peoples' bliss in their native state. One day, after a large audience had been told about his work, a hearer arose to bait him with the familiar canard: "You missionaries make me sick! Why force civilization on a people so unspoiled and happy? Why not leave 'em alone!"

Townsend replied, laughing, "I think, my friend, you've been no closer to jungle Indians than the movies. If you could sit down with them, as I have, and hear them tell in their own tongues the woes that haunt them through witchcraft, superstition, fear, and strife; listen to mothers tell of being forced to strangle their newborn babies because of some evil omen; see old folks being abandoned to die because they had become a burden; or sense the hatreds bred in them by generations of white men who took advantage of their ignorance to exploit them, steal their lands, ravage their women and ruthlessly shoot them down—well, then, my friend, you just might change your mind about Indians as a quaint people living lives of idyllic happiness."

Townsend is equally deft in parrying thrusts from another quarter—the religious. Such attacks are rare, since SIL's members represent no religious body, cooperate with all. There was, however, the time in 1953 when a Lima newspaper carried a series of articles by a prominent Roman Catholic blasting SIL workers as "Protestant wolves," their work sectarian and proselyting in nature, and demanding their expulsion. Townsend ignored the first blast. When others followed, he composed a letter to the editor which one Catholic authority applauded as a masterpiece of Christian love and reconciliation.

Townsend wrote in part: "It is not a question of 'wolves.' Every SIL member must promise that his service will be given in a spirit of love and brotherhood, without distinction as to race or creed. We do not call ourselves Protestants but simply believers in

Christ, and because of our nonsectarian nature we do not teach rituals and ecclesiastical systems.

"While we are motivated by the desire to serve God and humanity, we are at the same time scientists dedicated to the study of languages. And when we complete our linguistic investigations we shall go, leaving behind our base at Yarinacocha, with all its buildings, for a center of Indian education."

The letter was prominently displayed in the newspaper. The attacks ceased, and Townsend and his workers went on with their comradely friendship with Roman Catholic missionaries stationed in the jungle: gladly transporting them back and forth to their posts, repairing their radios, sharing medical supplies, bringing them to Yarinacocha for outing. The priests and nuns have responded in kind, performing innumerable acts of neighborly helpfulness to SIL workers. Both groups agree that the jungle, in Townsend's words, is too big and too needy for anybody there to quarrel with anybody else.

This year, the Papal Nuncio in Lima, cordially receiving Townsend, asked God's blessing upon his work after listening most graciously to how we hope to attain our goal of putting Holy Writ into 2,000 more languages in this generation.

I asked Townsend his chances of attaining that goal. Since SIL is thus far at work among only 175 of the 2,000 language groups, would he have to revise his estimate of the time it will take? Townsend's reply is the measure of his spirit.

"Not a bit," he said. "Consider the tempo of our advance. In 1942 we were at work in only one country; today we're in 12. Since 1942 our increase of workers has been 1,600 percent. At that rate our membership will number more than 12,000 in 15 years. That should do it."

I began to understand why the late Josephus Daniels, then United States Ambassador to Mexico, had called Townsend a man with the most audacious faith, I ever knew.

Surely no project is built more completely on faith. From the time that he and Leonard Legters, SIL's cofounder, decided to emulate Abram in trusting God even to going out, not knowing whither, Townsend's guiding principle has been, go nowhere God doesn't lead; go anywhere He does. The method for finding out what is God leading? We simply take our inner urges to God in prayer, saying, "If this is Thy will, not ours alone, open the way." Then if support comes, we know that the door has not been jimmied by our will but has been opened by God's hand.

Neither does Townsend campaign for funds in the usual ways, even with an annual budget which exceeds a million dollars. He says, "I have never asked a man directly for a dollar, and I never shall." To him, the wheedling of gifts from reluctant givers is not only a denial of trust in God; it's an offense to the dignity of God's work, and does little for the giver. "We like our givers to be God-inspired partners, not badgered Lady Bountifuls."

His practice of waiting for God's go-ahead, with funds providentially provided, permeates the whole SIL organization. No member is salaried. There is no guaranteed allowance. Each is expected to look to the Lord to stir the hearts of interested people to support his work—without the worker himself lifting a syllable in direct request. "Give full information without solicitation," Townsend tells SIL members.

Getting enthusiastic cooperation for his SIL program is another mark of the Townsend genius. "We do not go into any country nowadays," he says, "without being invited." True; but he shows a remarkable talent for getting invited. He spends much time frequenting conferences where educators and officials discuss their indigenes and what to do about them. Mingling with the experts,

he quietly tells what SIL has accomplished elsewhere. As in Mexico, Peru, and Ecuador, he has not had to wangle permission to enter; they invite him in—fast, with full government cooperation.

In tribute to his work with their people, Latin-American nations have showered Townsend with kudos. Colleges and universities seek him as lecturer, have tried to load him with honorary degrees—most of which he has respectfully declined. The President of Peru has decorated him with the Order of Merit for Distinguished Service, rarely accorded to non-Peruvians. The Government of Ecuador has conferred upon him the Decoration of Merit, acclaiming him spiritual conqueror of the jungle.

But the tribute that has moved him most came from an Indian chief in the Amazonian jungle, whose tribe he and his SIL had transformed with hope. Said the chief, "Before you came, there was only darkness. Now there is only light."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to commend the Senator from Colorado, who, as we all know, is an extremely conscientious, hard-working, and cooperating member of any team, for serving so magnificently on the team, as described by the Senator from Alabama.

I have listened to his speech with deep interest. I hope the bill may be passed as is. I certainly appreciate the tremendous amount of effort and initiative which the Senator from Colorado has shown in respect to a study of the bill.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

FATE OF JEWISH POPULATION IN THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS SATELLITES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is a fact that the Jewish community of some 3 million souls in the Soviet Union has been completely cut off from the rest of the Jewish people of the world, denied contact with them, denied the right to participate in international Jewish conferences, in global Jewish relief effort, and even refused the elementary right of obtaining books and periodicals of Jewish interest published in other countries. This is despite a longstanding and long-forgotten statute against anti-Semitism providing for prison terms up to 2 years, despite widely touted assertions that this bias does not exist in the U. S. S. R., because it is a tool of the "imperialist bourgeoisie in order to create national hatred" and despite claims that the 42 percent of the Soviet's population who are non-Russian enjoy equal freedoms.

The New York Herald Tribune has noted editorially the sixth anniversary of the execution of Jewish intellectuals by the Soviet Communists under Josef Stalin. This anniversary had been brought to mind by a letter to that paper written by a former colleague in the House of Representatives, Mrs. Helen Gahagan Douglas. Mrs. Douglas noted that these executions were the culmination of a campaign of cultural genocide begun by Stalin in 1948 with the closing of all Jewish cultural institutions.

our coastline, or the laurel which grows out of our soil so profusely throughout our State. These ships were built by skilled mechanical and scientific Connecticut know-how in the yards of the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp. They were foreshadowed by the first submarines which were the production of the brains of John Holland and Simon Lake. The Connecticut communities of New London and Groton have lived with submarines and submariners since there have been either.

Mr. President, the great skill of our Connecticut workmen responded to the dynamic vision and leadership of Admiral Rickover to production of these atomic marvels which have sailed under the North Pole to mark new and great scientific strides of mankind.

We in Connecticut, like our fellow citizens throughout the Nation, took great pride in these feats. We were particularly pleased that our State—the great manufacturing arsenal of our Republic—which has pioneered in the air, on the ground, and on the sea, has once again contributed to further knowledge of the undersea world of the submerged polar region.

In behalf of my fellow citizens, I wish to extend our congratulations to the officers and men of the *Nautilus* and the *Skate* and to suggest that this body officially commend and salute these new beacons of the atomic age and the personnel who manned them.

At the same time, Mr. President, I am writing to the Postmaster General suggesting that the first commemorative 4-cent stamp be a replica of the *Nautilus* and that it be issued in recognition of the first undersea polar voyage.

Finally, Mr. President, all of us in Connecticut are humbly grateful that once again our greatest natural resource—our people—has been permitted by a kind Providence to participate in these most significant events in the furtherance of our national knowledge and of mankind's continuing exploration of the unknown.

I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

CORNELIUS J. DANAHER

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my brief remarks, editorials from the Hartford Courant, from the Hartford Times, both of August 2, and the Catholic Transcript of August 7, 1958, in tribute to one of Connecticut's most outstanding citizens and its oldest practicing lawyer, Cornelius J. Danaher, 87, who recently died at his home in Meriden, Conn.

Mr. Danaher was a personal friend of two presidents, Theodore Roosevelt and Herbert Hoover, and the father of John A. Danaher, now judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and a former member of this body; Francis R. Danaher, a former mayor of Meriden, Conn.; Cornelius J. Danaher, Jr., a judge in the Meriden Municipal Court; and

Lawrence Danaher, a real estate and insurance man in Meriden.

A member of St. Joseph's Parish, Meriden, he was named a Knight of St. Gregory by Pope Pius XII in 1957.

The oldest living practicing attorney in Connecticut, Mr. Danaher, who was admitted to the State bar in 1893, served as State Labor Commissioner of Connecticut from 1939 to 1944, and he was known as the father of the State Workmen's Compensation Act which he helped put through the State legislature in 1933. Long a champion of the underdog, Mr. Danaher was counsel for the Connecticut Federation of Labor for more than 40 years and appeared year after year at the General Assembly urging passage of labor bills. In addition to his work with the Compensation Act, he established mercury poisoning as an occupational disease and wrote the clause limiting baseball activities to either the American or National leagues. A lover of baseball, Mr. Danaher owned the Meriden and New Haven teams from 1904 to about 1918.

Mr. Danaher, or Connie, as he was popularly known throughout the State, was indeed a talented man, a brilliant orator, and a faithful and devoted public servant. His activities and accomplishments during his career will long be remembered.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times of August 2, 1958]

CORNELIUS JOSEPH DANAHER

Some measure, large or small, of "Connie" Danaher's infectious enthusiasm always rubbed off on all who knew him. It made no difference whether that friendship was a passing and casual one or an intimate association of long-years standing. He had that type of ebullient personality that is rare among men.

Cornelius Joseph Danaher died Friday morning at his home in Meriden, the city of his birth (August 10, 1870), where he was active throughout his long life. The range of his interests was broad and varied. He served his church, his city, and his State with distinction for more than half a century.

Graduated from the Yale Law School in 1893, he quickly plunged into public affairs in which his interest remained keen and alert throughout his life. He was a stout advocate of all the causes in which he firmly believed, a skilled orator of the old school whose resonant and dramatic voice held many a group in rapt attention. He was a debater whom no one cared to tackle unless fully informed on the subject at issue.

For many years Mr. Danaher served as counsel for the Connecticut Federation of Labor and in that period vigorously supported before general assembly committees many pieces of progressive legislation in the interests of the working man. He served as State Labor Commissioner from 1939 to 1944.

Cornelius Danaher was a man of genuine charm and high spirit. He had a ready anecdote to fit most every situation. He was a sympathetic and helpful friend to all who came to him in need of counsel.

Connecticut has lost a faithful and devoted public servant whose good works will be his most lasting monument.

[From the Hartford Courant of August 2, 1958]

Connie Danaher had an unflinching interest in people and things. Whether he was tell-

ing you about James Gates Percival, a strange Connecticut genius, or the records of the New Haven and Meriden teams he used to own in the old Eastern League, his booming voice, winning ways, and smooth command of the language fascinated his listeners. He was a fighter with strong convictions, but he was also a charming companion, a devoted family man, and a hard-working lawyer.

Yet, when you say all those things, how do you sum up Connie Danaher? You've missed his record with labor, first as attorney for the Connecticut Federation of Labor and author of the State's Workmen's Compensation Act—which averaged about \$25 million in payments last year—later as State labor commissioner. You've missed the memory of the political scuffles that Connie gloried in, his appearances at meetings in behalf of candidates, of whom it was said that none lost if Connie Danaher was there to speak for him.

In tough, this was an exuberant man of great personality, of great worth. He was a person who loved life, a man with a touch of poetry on his lips, a fondness for learning, profound interest in human beings, pride in his family and their accomplishments, faith and devotion, and an eternal curiosity that bespoke eternal youth. Any one of these would mark a man. Connie Danaher had them all.

[From the Catholic Transcript of August 7, 1958]

Cornelius J. Danaher, who died last week just before completing his 88th year, was almost as much a feature of the Connecticut scene and as seemingly indestructible as the Meriden hills which he knew and loved from boyhood. A man of many parts, a personality colorful and zesty, he was a conspicuous success as a lawyer, a businessman, a sportsman, a political figure, and a public servant. Gifted with notable intelligence, he was not lacking in sentiment, as anyone who ever conversed with him or heard him on the platform can readily attest. In him these attributes were nicely balanced. He was a vigorous crusader for good causes, earnestly concerned that justice be done and goodness prevail. To the orator's task he brought a ringing voice, a decisive manner, and a sweeping style. He let his views be known beyond mistaking, forcefully supported them with pertinent argument, and exercised unusual powers of persuasion. He was not, like some public men, an actor of a dual role, one thing when before the general run of people, another, quite different thing in private. Always and everywhere he was consistently himself; he had integrity of a high order. A sterling patriot, devoted to his family, an ardent and active member of the church, he shed luster on them all. His was a long, crowded, wonderfully good life, during which he made many his beneficiaries.

CONSTRUCTION OF DEMONSTRATION PLANTS FOR CONVERSION OF SALINE WATER TO WATER SUITABLE FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, which were, on page 3, line 5, after "five" insert "experi-

mental"; on page 3, line 12, after "processes" insert ", and each plant shall demonstrate a different process"; on page 3, line 12, strike out all after "processes." down through and including line 16, and insert "A decision with respect to the process to be utilized in the first of these five plants shall be made by the Secretary within 6 months after the date of approval of this joint resolution and decisions with respect to the processes to be utilized in the other plants shall follow at intervals of not more than 6 months, and the construction of such plants shall proceed as rapidly as is practicable."

On page 4, line 3, strike out "Such" and insert "The sea water conversion"; on page 4, line 11, after "States;" insert "and"; on page 4, strike out lines 12 through 16, inclusive; on page 4, line 17, strike out "(C)" and insert "(B)"; on page 4, line 19, strike out "Territorial possession" and insert "Territory or island area"; on page 4, lines 20 and 21, strike out "and/or additional electric power"; on page 5, after line 21, insert:

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to accept financial and other assistance from any State or public agency in connection with studies, surveys, location, construction, operation, or other work relating to saline or brackish water conversion problems and facilities for such conversion, and to enter into contracts with respect to such assistance, which contracts shall detail the purposes for which the assistance is contributed. Any funds so contributed shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary in like manner as if they had been specifically appropriated for purposes for which they are contributed, and any funds not expended for these purposes shall be returned to the State or public agency from which they were received.

On page 5, line 22, strike out "SEC. 3." and insert "Sec. 4."; on page 6, line 1, strike out "five-year" and insert "seven-year"; on page 6, line 4, after "Congress." insert "Upon such sale, there shall be returned to any State or public agency which has contributed financial assistance under section 3 of this act a proper share of the net proceeds of the sale."; on page 6, line 5, strike out "SEC. 4." and insert "SEC. 5."; on page 6, after line 11, insert:

SEC. 6. When appropriations have been made for the construction or operation and maintenance of any demonstration plant under this act, the Secretary may, in connection with such construction or operation and maintenance enter into contracts for construction for materials and supplies, and for miscellaneous services, which may cover such periods of time as he shall consider necessary but in which the liability of the United States shall be contingent upon appropriations being available therefor.

On page 6, line 12, strike out "SEC. 5." and insert "SEC. 7."

And to amend the title so as to read: Joint resolution providing for the construction of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 135, request a conference with the House on

the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand the proposed action is agreeable to the minority leader.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. KUCHEL, conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES FOLLOWING THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, would the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] be kind enough to point out the measures to which he referred when he talked to me earlier today, which he desires to call up for consideration and which have been reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are Calendar No. 2248, S. 3648, and Calendar No. 2255, S. 1887.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Order No. 2248, S. 3648 was introduced by the Senators from New Mexico. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navaho Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating project of the Colorado River storage project.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. Also Calendar No. 2255.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Calendar No. 2255 is S. 1887, and was introduced by the Senators from California. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like all Members of the Senate to be on notice that we will have a call of the calendar tomorrow. Following the call of the calendar it is my intention to call up several bills on motion. I anticipate that the Policy Committee will clear these bills. I should therefore like the Senator from Mexico to be prepared—as he always is, although I should like to give him advance notice now—to answer any questions with respect to these bills, if any should be raised. Does the Senator from New Mexico have in mind any other bills?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not at this time. I thank the majority leader.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237), the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last winter, when the proposal for a Federal scholarship program first received widespread attention in the Congress and among the public, I had occasion to set forth my views with respect to such a program, as compared with a Federal-aid-to-school-construction program, in a brief article for the periodical Oregon Higher Education. This is a publication of the Oregon Education Association, edited by Dr. David D. Darland.

In this statement of my views for Oregon Higher Education, I explained why I believe a program of Federal financial assistance to grade and high schools to be the basic need of educational progress in our country, even though I also approve thoroughly of the idea of Federal scholarships which is now before us. I quoted from an exchange of correspondence which I had on this whole subject with our able and dedicated Senate leader in the field of education, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL]. Of course, I have been a sponsor of the Federal aid to education bill introduced by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], S. 3311, as well as my own S. 777.

Rather than review at this time in detail the reasons for my views on these subjects, I ask unanimous consent that my statement for Oregon Higher Education of the issue for winter 1957-58 be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Long before the publicity of the sputniks led the administration to propose to Congress a plan for science scholarships, I favored some program of Federal support for students at the university and college level. But it is my conviction that such a program should not single out science study, and that it must take second priority to the financial needs of improved primary and secondary education in our country.

If we had unlimited funds we could do everything at once. But I think Federal scholarships are the dessert of education—very much worthwhile, but not quite as imperative to our total educational effort as adequate and effective schooling in the elementary and secondary grades. Every part of a meal is important, but I suppose a family of limited means would buy meat and vegetables first and then spend money on the dessert.

I believe a sound foundation comes first, whether you are educating a citizen or erecting a skyscraper. The grade school and the high school comprise the foundation. College is the superstructure built upon such a foundation. The foundation is of prime importance.

University and college scholarships are necessary if all our talented young people are to have the opportunity to develop their brains and skills. But these young people will not be prepared to make the most of that opportunity on a college campus, unless they have the earlier benefit of sound schooling in the grade and secondary levels.

I believe that men like Fermi, Einstein, Teller, and Oppenheimer have been as much the products of their grade schools and high schools as they have been of college

laboratories and graduate schools. An illiterate cannot enter Oxford or Heidelberg and become a genius; something has had to happen earlier. That is why I strongly urge that college scholarships be goals in and of themselves, and never substitutes for a sound and thorough program of Federal aid to more effective education in grade and secondary schools.

Actually, when we discuss the "new" proposals for Federal scholarships, we should never forget that in the decade following World War II this country maintained the largest, most far-reaching and most successful Government scholarship program in history. The educational benefits of the G. I. bill of rights were milestones in our democracy's approach to making up the lost and sacrificed years in the lives of those who fought to defend it. A generation of our skilled and professional workers—scientists, teachers, doctors, civil servants—obtained their higher education under the G. I. bill. This program did not press them into any specific fields of study—their interests, suitability and success, above a necessary minimum, were a matter between them and the academic institutions to which they sought admission.

When the administration permitted the G. I. bill to lapse 2 years ago, I introduced legislation to renew it. Perhaps different conditions of the present time require changes in the format of a Federal scholarship program, although I strongly believe it should contain special provisions for the young men whom we still urge or draft into the Nation's armed forces. And I continue to believe that the Federal Government should first funnel much-needed financial support into our grade and high schools, for example through a school-construction measure such as last year's Kelley bill in the House of Representatives, which I introduced in the Senate.

Thus, when Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, who as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has long been an outstanding leader in the cause of Federal aid to education, recently introduced his Federal-scholarship bill S. 3187, I wrote him as follows in agreeing to co-sponsor this bill:

"It has been my own view that we must not be misled, by the current spotlight which has been thrown upon the immediate production of scientists to meet an apparent Soviet technological challenge, from the fact that it is the quality of our grade school and high school education which will in a major measure determine the reservoir of trained intelligence available to the Nation in the years ahead. There is much merit and justice in a program of scholarships to make available advanced education to those among our brightest and ablest youngsters who would otherwise be financially precluded from it. As you know, I have long proposed revival of the G. I. bill educational program as being in part responsive to that need. I would hope that any Federal scholarship program—whether or not it makes special provisions for servicemen—would not be too predominantly directed at scientific skills.

"However, as I say, I am convinced that measures to strengthen the quality of the curriculum and academic discipline of the grade and high schools are in the long run most essential to meet the educational needs which are now receiving much widespread attention."

Senator HILL replied, in a very generous letter, that "Like you, I strongly believe that we must buttress our entire educational program at all levels"; that "no one proposal should preempt the field of education"; and that "the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will cover in its hearings all proposed legislation that the Federal Govern-

ment might carry out to strengthen the basic educational structure of our country."

The fact is that, apart from its other shortcomings, the science and language scholarship plan proposed by the Eisenhower administration is—in spite of all the crisis oratory about education following the sputniks—actually a smaller total Federal program than that proposed last year. In spite of all the science-education hullabaloo of last autumn, the administration's 1959 budget actually contains fewer funds for education than that for fiscal 1958. School construction has been forgotten. The administration has even proposed cut-backs in the program to aid Federal-impact school districts. And I need hardly mention that the greatest Federal impact on school needs in recent years resulted from the policy of forcing up interest rates, which added so greatly to the interest burdens and financing difficulties of school construction by local authorities.

As I wrote Senator HILL, I remained convinced that the quality of our elementary and secondary education has a greater significance for our ultimate output of truly educated college men and women than any scholarship program at the college level itself, valuable as that would be. Today, it is the quality of grade and high school education that determines the level at which our colleges and universities can work—not vice versa. Perhaps, as Adm. Hyman G. Rickover has suggested, the universities under the present pressure on their facilities could reverse this by jointly setting uniform academic standards for high-school diplomas to be acceptable evidence for admission. But until now, only a few select centers of learning have been in a position to impose that sort of quality control in selecting freshmen who could maintain a high level of true university work. In most American colleges and universities, now under unprecedented enrollment pressure, the most brilliant freshman has little chance to forge beyond an academic program necessarily geared to the preparation of the normal high school graduate.

That is why I believe that a scholarship program alone is an inadequate response to our currently much discussed educational needs. True, it would permit a number of able and deserving students to obtain an advanced education in our present system. For this reason, I support it. But it seems to me that far greater dividends would be obtained from a program which would help—insofar as money is the need—to strengthen substantially the foundation upon which the subsequent education of almost all college students rests.

A scholarship program alone can help some tens of thousands of our best high-school graduates a year. But a program for grade and high schools that would make possible better facilities, less overworked and better paid teachers with more opportunities for professional preparation, smaller classes with more chance for fast tracks for the college-bound—such a program would help not only those few thousands but all the millions of American college students, by permitting our universities to raise substantially the level and speed of academic work for all students. Having already more young people in college than any other nation, we should not then have to worry about maintaining adequate replacements of academically skilled and professional men and women for America's future. That would be the kind of goals and programs I would like to see the Federal Government support financially.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNAMARA obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I

may suggest the absence of a quorum, then move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar, and at the conclusion of the Executive Calendar the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] may be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senate aids will notify all Members of the Senate that we are about to have a yea and nay vote and that Senators should respond to the quorum call. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

TAX PROTOCOL WITH UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive A—85th Congress, 2d session—a tax protocol with the United Kingdom.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the supplementary protocol (executive A, 85th Congress, 2d session) between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on August 19, 1957, amending the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on April 16, 1945, as modified by the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on June 6, 1946, and the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on May 25, 1954, which was read the second time, as follows:

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

Desiring to conclude a further supplementary Protocol amending the Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on the 16th April 1945, as modified by the supplementary Protocol signed at Washington on the 6th June 1946 and by the supplementary Protocol signed at Washington on the 25th May 1954,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Paragraphs (1) and (2) of article VIII of the Convention of the 16th April 1945 for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to taxes on income are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Royalties and other amounts paid as consideration for the use of, or for the privi-

ilege of using, copyrights, patents, designs, secret processes and formulae, trademarks, and other like property, and derived from sources within the United States by a resident of the United Kingdom who is subject to United Kingdom tax on such royalties or other amounts shall be exempt from United States tax (a) if such resident is not engaged in trade or business in the United States through a permanent establishment situated therein or (b) if such resident is so engaged, the royalties or other amounts are not directly associated with the business carried on through that permanent establishment.

"(2) Royalties and other amounts paid as consideration for the use of, or for the privilege of using, copyrights, patents, designs, secret processes and formulae, trademarks, and other like property, and derived from sources within the United Kingdom by a resident of the United States who is subject to United States tax on such royalties or other amounts shall be exempt from United Kingdom tax (a) if such resident is not engaged in trade or business in the United Kingdom through a permanent establishment situated therein or (b) if such resident is so engaged, the royalties or other amounts are not directly associated with the business carried on through that permanent establishment."

ARTICLE II

Paragraph (1) of article XIII of the said convention is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Subject to sections 901 to 905 of the United States Internal Revenue Code as in effect on the 1st day of January 1956, United Kingdom tax shall be allowed as a credit against United States tax. For this purpose—

"(a) the recipient of a dividend paid by a corporation which is a resident of the United Kingdom shall be deemed to have paid the United Kingdom tax appropriate to such dividend, and

"(b) the recipient of any royalty or other amount coming within the scope of article VIII of the present convention shall be deemed to have paid any United Kingdom tax legally deducted from the royalty or other amount by the person by or through whom any payment thereof is made,

If the recipient of the dividend or royalty or other amount, as the case may be, elects to include in his gross income for the purposes of United States tax the amount of such United Kingdom income tax."

ARTICLE III

(1) This supplementary Protocol shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at London as soon as possible.

(2) This supplementary Protocol shall enter into force upon the exchange of instruments of ratification and shall thereupon have effect—

(a) In the United Kingdom:

(i) as respects income tax and surtax for any year of assessment beginning on or after the 6th April 1956;

(ii) as respects profits tax for any chargeable accounting period beginning on or after the 1st April 1956, and for the unexpired portion of any chargeable accounting period current at that date.

(b) In the United States: As respects taxable years beginning on or after the 1st day of January 1956.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this supplementary protocol and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate at Washington this 19th day of August 1957.

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL]

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

[SEAL]

HAROLD CACCIA.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this protocol amends the 1945 tax convention with the United Kingdom so as to eliminate double taxation of royalty payments on patents, copyrights, trademarks, and things of that nature.

As the convention now stands, these payments are taxed twice when they are paid by a United Kingdom licensee to an American licensor with a permanent establishment in the United Kingdom. In these cases, a United Kingdom tax is collected from the licensee, and the American tax is collected from the licensor who is not given credit for the British tax paid by the licensee.

The protocol would correct this situation by providing an exemption from British tax in cases in which the payments are not related to the business operations carried on by the licensor's permanent establishment in the United Kingdom. In cases in which the payments were not exempt from the British tax, the protocol would make the American foreign tax credit available to the licensor.

These provisions operate on a reciprocal basis.

The Senate should be aware, Mr. President, that objection has been made to this protocol by one—and only one—large American corporation which has a number of net royalty arrangements with British firms. Under these arrangements, the American corporation receives a fixed amount of royalties, after all British taxes have been paid by the licensees. The amount of the British tax, therefore, does not affect the net payment received by the American company.

The particular corporation—and the only one—to which I refer appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, and complained that it would not receive any relief under the protocol. It preferred a legislative approach under which it would receive a retroactive windfall going back to 1950. On the other hand, it made no showing that it would suffer disadvantage under the protocol.

The Foreign Relations Committee was not persuaded by that single objection; but I thought that in fairness I should call it to the attention of the Senate. At the same time, I point out that the protocol is strongly supported by the National Foreign Trade Council and, of course, by the Treasury and the Department of State.

I urge the Senate to add its approval.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the protocol between the United States and

Great Britain is under debate, I wish to take only a few moments to comment on another matter.

I suppose it is true that I have been as critical, if not more critical, of many phases of American foreign policy under this administration as has any other Member of the Senate. I have been particularly critical of American foreign policy in regard to the Middle East; and I still am critical of American foreign policy, as of the past, in the Middle East.

But, Mr. President, in my service in the Senate whenever one with whom I disagree on some matters follows, in respect to another matter, a course of action with which I agree, I always try to be fair and to say so.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I am proud to be an American, in light of the speech the President of the United States made this morning before the General Assembly of the United Nations. In that speech, I think the President enunciated a program of action which, if we succeed in implementing it, will stand to the everlasting credit of our foreign policy.

I am fully aware of the fact, Mr. President, that some of the President's proposals were couched in very general and, in connection with his reference to Jordan, in somewhat ambiguous terms. Yet, when we read the speech and examine it from its four corners, and then compare it with the speech subsequently delivered by the Russian representative, I believe there is no question or doubt that the goals of America are peaceful, whereas the goals of the Russians obviously are motivated by a desire to stir up international trouble.

Mr. President, the broad outlines of the President's program, as set forth in his speech in the United Nations General Assembly this morning were laid down by him, I believe, in a very able manner. Now it becomes the duty of this administration to do everything possible to implement that program. In the past President Eisenhower has made some very fine speeches setting forth some very sound objectives but unfortunately, he has failed to carry through on his words. Even a President should be judged by the maxim—actions speak louder than words. I pray and trust that this time the President will devote and dedicate himself to implementing the program he outlined in his speech.

Furthermore, it also becomes the duty of the United Nations, in connection with its search for peace, to give the support necessary for United Nations implementation of the parts of the President's proposals which require United Nations action. For instance, the recommendation of the President with regard to United Nations forces, and the recommendation of the President with regard to the United Nations as a whole playing a greater part in maintaining peace in the Middle East calls upon our friends in the United Nations to support a program for United Nations forces and United Nations guaranties of territorial integrity.

Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. After talking to the chairman of the subcommittee, I have been led to believe that favorable action will be taken on that measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from California that if the committee is able to take action—and I know it will if it can—he will have the cooperation of the leadership on both sides of the aisle, particularly the cooperation of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], on any matter affecting California; and I have always found California Senators to be irresistible. [Laughter.]

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION SERVICE IN SOUTHEASTERN ALASKA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1798) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to certain small vessels operated by cooperatives or associations in transporting merchandise of members on a nonprofit basis to or from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and Prince Rupert, British Columbia, or to or from places within said inland waters and places within the inland waters of the State of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report, which is signed by all the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Friday, Aug. 8, 1958, p. 15369, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the statement by the managers on the part of the House.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1798) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to certain small vessels operated by cooperatives or associations in transporting merchandise of members on a nonprofit basis to or from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and Prince Rupert, British Columbia, or to or from places within said inland waters and places within the inland waters of the State of Washington, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recom-

mended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment was designed to assure the availability of water transportation to communities within the protected inland waters of southeastern Alaska, with particular regard to the smaller outposts having no or inadequate regular common-carrier service. Under the House amendment small vessels owned or chartered by cooperative associations would not be deemed carrying "freight for hire" within the meaning of the inspection laws, if their operations were limited to the ports of southeastern Alaska generally, including operations to and from those ports having more or less frequent common-carrier service.

Section 2 of the House amendment further restricts the waiver of the inspection laws only to vessels constructed prior to the enactment of the act and presently in operation in Alaskan waters. Section 2 further provides that the act cease to be effective on and after June 30, 1962. These limitations were intended as inducement to the present operators to replace their vessels in the not too distant future with new vessels suitable for the trade, and complying with the inspection laws.

The conference substitute would further amend section 2 of the House amendment by removing the requirement that the vessels affected be only those "now in operation in Alaskan waters" and the provision that the act cease to be effective on and after June 30, 1962. In lieu of the stricken language the conference substitute adds a proviso that on and after March 15, 1960, the exemption from the inspection laws shall apply only to vessels engaged in transportation to and from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska not receiving annual weekly transportation service from any part of the United States by an established common carrier by water. It is further provided, however, that this limitation is not applicable to the transportation of cargo of a character not accepted for transportation by any such common carrier.

The conferees recognize the essentiality of assuring continued availability of water transportation to the southeastern Alaskan communities not adequately served by common carriers by water or other forms of transportation. Therefore, it is the intent of the conferees of the House and the Senate that the situation be again carefully reviewed prior to March 15, 1960, in order to ascertain whether or not further legislative action may be needed, to assure essential service to and from such communities on a reasonable basis.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
ED A. GARMATZ,
FRANK BOYKIN,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237), the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as 8-7-58-F, which I offer in behalf of myself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. LANGER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HENNING, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. JAVITS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

TITLE XIII—SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1958

Short Title

SEC. 1301. This title may be cited as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1958."

Definitions

SEC. 1302. For purposes of this title—

(1) The term "school facilities", except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes), for education which is provided as elementary or secondary education, in the applicable State, at public expense and under public supervision and direction. Such term does not include athletic stadiums, or other structures or facilities, intended primarily for event, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public, or off-site improvement, or structures or facilities designed to be used exclusively for special activities, such as single-purpose auditoriums and gymnasiums.

(2) The terms "constructing" and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

Findings and declaration of purpose

SEC. 1303. The Congress finds that there is an appalling national shortage of public elementary and secondary school facilities despite strenuous efforts of States and local communities, because their limited financial resources simply are not adequate to support necessary construction programs to eliminate such shortages. In many cases, local communities are hampered in their efforts to solve their problems by restrictive debt and tax limits, by the uneven distribution of taxable real estate among school districts, by their inability to borrow necessary funds at reasonable rates of interest, or similar reasons.

The Congress, while recognizing that responsibility for providing adequate school facilities is primarily that of the several States and their communities, finds that the national interest in our public school system requires that the Federal Government assist the States, consistent with their respective responsibilities, in meeting school construction needs. The Congress recognizes that the solution of this problem will require a long-range Federal assistance school construction program. However, in view of the emergency created by the appalling shortage of classrooms, an immediate Federal school construction program is necessary. It is the purpose of this title to provide such emergency assistance to the States, so that this critical problem of inadequate school facilities may be attacked immediately in the light of current and anticipated school shortages, by authorizing grants to State educational agencies.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 1304. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, and the next succeeding fiscal year, such amounts, not to exceed \$1 billion in either fiscal year, as may be necessary for making payments to State educational agencies under this title.

Allotments to States

SEC. 1305. From the total funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 1304, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the total funds so appropriated as the school-age population of the State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all the States.

State plans

SEC. 1306. (a) Any State which desires to accept the benefits of this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which shall—

(1) provide that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(2) set forth a program under which funds paid to the State under this title will be expended solely for school facilities construction projects approved by the State educational agency;

(3) provide for such fiscal control and fund-accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this title;

(4) provide for the establishment of standards on a State level for planning and constructing school facilities; and

(5) provide that the State educational agency will make reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information as is reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title.

(b) Any State plan or modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) shall be approved by the Commissioner but he shall not finally disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording the State educational agency involved reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

no further reservations shall be made under section 1307 (b) for projects in the State, and there shall be no further payments for any project directly affected by such failure, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended. The Commissioner, after notice as provided in this subsection to any State may suspend further reservations of funds under section 1307 (b) for projects pending the making of findings under this subsection.

Payments to States

SEC. 1307. (a) Payments under this title shall be made only to those State educational agencies which administer plans approved under section 1306 and which furnish statements to the Commissioner in accordance with this section. Every statement shall set forth one or more projects approved by the State educational agency under the plan, the estimated cost of each such project, and the amount which the State educational agency desires to be paid out of the State's allotment for each project.

(b) Except as provided in section 1308, the Commissioner shall issue, to each State educational agency furnishing a statement in accordance with subsection (a), a commitment reserving, out of the State's allotment, for each project included in the statement, the amount requested by the State educational agency for that project. Upon request of the State educational agency and receipt of an amended statement from such agency, the Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved, but only to the extent that the change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of this title. Such payments to the State educational agency shall be made by the Commissioner through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury, upon certification by the State educational

agency that the financing of the remainder of the cost of construction of the project has been arranged. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of constructing the project for which the amount was reserved and for no other purpose.

(c) If any project for which one or more payments have been made under this section is abandoned, or is not completed within a reasonable period determined under regulations of the Commissioner, the State to which such payments were made shall repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amount as may be reasonable under the circumstances (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the Federal district court for the district in which such project is located).

Matching by States

SEC. 1308. The Commissioner may issue or modify a commitment under section 1307 only if the amount to be reserved under the commitment, plus any amounts paid or to be paid under other commitments previously issued under this title to the same State educational agency, does not exceed one-half of the sum of (1) the cost of constructing the project in question and (2) the total cost of constructing the projects for which such other commitments have been issued, and if the State educational agency certifies that the remainder of the cost of constructing the project in question will be paid out of funds other than funds paid by the Commissioner under Public Law 815, 81st Congress, as amended. Until actual construction costs are available, cost determinations under this section shall be made on the basis of estimates furnished under section 1307 (a) and revised estimates furnished in compliance with section 1306 (a) (5).

Judicial review

SEC. 1309. (a) Any State dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action under section 1306, may appeal to the United States district court for the district in which the capital of the State is located. Summons and notice of appeal may be served any place in the United States and the Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court a transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The court shall have jurisdiction either to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States, as provided in sections 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Amend the table of contents by inserting at the end thereof the following:

Title XIII—School Construction Assistance Act of 1958

Sec. 1301. Short title.

Sec. 1302. Definitions.

Sec. 1303. Findings and declaration of purpose.

Sec. 1304. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 1305. Allotments to States.

Sec. 1306. State plans.

Sec. 1307. Payments to States.

Sec. 1308. Matching by States.

Sec. 1309. Judicial review.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself, I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the proposed agreement, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective upon the adoption of this agreement, during the further consideration of S. 4237, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, with the exception of the school construction amendment, 8-7-58-F, hereinafter referred to, proposed by Senator McNAMARA, on behalf of himself and other Senators, debate upon any amendment, motion, or appeal shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided, and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided*, That upon the school construction amendment, debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, as in the case of any other amendment: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received. For purposes of this agreement, the said school construction amendment, 8-7-58-F, shall be considered germane.

Ordered further, That after the third reading of S. 4237, it shall be in order for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of H. R. 13247, the companion House bill; that the said bill shall be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of S. 4237, as amended; that the said amendment to H. R. 13247 shall be deemed to be engrossed, and the bill, as amended, to be read the third time.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of said House bill, as amended, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided, and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of said bill, allot additional time to any Senator, during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Michigan yield to himself?

Mr. McNAMARA. Thirty minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with many of my colleagues who have had words of praise for the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, not only for the outstanding work he has done, in the present circumstances, dealing with aid to education in the form of a scholarship bill, but also for his many years of devotion to the educational system of the United States.

The Federal scholarship bill now before the Senate is an important measure.

It is important in that it represents a relatively broad Federal aid program instead of one limited by specific requirements as are the GI bill and impacted area programs.

Moreover, the scholarship bill is a much-needed recognition of the importance of scientific education in today's world to meet the needs of tomorrow.

We can be thankful for the awakening from our slumber brought about by the first sputnik.

However, I regret to say that, fine as the scholarship bill is, it meets only about 5 percent of our national education problem.

I do not mean to imply that the bill before us is insignificant. In my opinion it is a very fine bill as far as it goes.

While it is another acknowledgment of the right and the duty of the Federal Government to offer direct financial assistance in the field of education, the measure attacks the problem at a level, comparatively speaking, where the least assistance is required.

It is, to a large extent, like constructing a building by starting with the top floor.

The place to start is at the foundation. This is as true in the field of education as it is in the construction industry.

The proper training of scientists, engineers or members of any other profession begins long before the college level.

That is so obvious that it should not even have to be stated. Yet, that very basic principle is constantly overlooked or purposely ignored when we discuss education assistance.

The years a child spends in primary and secondary schools are the formative years.

These are the years when he builds his study habits.

These are the years when he builds his basic education foundation for his future career as a useful member of society, whether or not he completes a formal college level education.

How can we help that student gain these vital study habits and build this foundation if the proper primary and secondary school environment is not provided.

This is where we must start. This is where America's future begins.

There are two basic problems at the primary and secondary levels of education.

One concerns the critical shortage of teachers and the low level of teachers' salaries.

Today thousands of properly trained teachers are desperately needed to relieve a critical shortage.

The shortage of teachers is not immediately apparent because school districts meet it with emergency measures, such as by recruiting temporary, and too often poorly trained teachers, increasing the class size or by having pupils attend schools half days.

None of these measures is in keeping with America's reputation for greatness, or is proper for American education.

Baling wire and chewing gum might serve in an emergency to get a car to the garage for permanent repairs.

But the damage done a student during these formative school years by ill-trained teachers, crowded rooms or half-day sessions is permanent damage that cannot be repaired. It will follow that individual to his grave.

One reason there is a shortage, of course, is the low level of teachers' salaries.

The National Education Association estimates that the average salary for teachers is only \$4,650 a year, scarcely above the average manufacturing wage, despite the teachers' necessary educational requirements.

The teachers represent an important part of our basic education problem, but it is to another part of the problem that I wish to address my main attention.

That is the continuing and growing shortage of classrooms at the primary and secondary school level.

Let me say here that meeting the classroom shortage problem through Federal assistance to the States can help attack the teacher problem.

Federal financial assistance to the States for school construction will, in turn, free some local money that could then be used to improve teachers' salaries.

The classroom shortage has been well documented by responsible authorities. The most conservative estimate of the shortage nationwide is 140,000 classrooms.

Unfortunately, this is not a shortage that we can expect to see reduced annually as the States build more classrooms. If so, there might be some excuse for inaction.

From all indications this is a continuing shortage that will become worse faster than it can be reduced.

It includes classrooms needed to keep up with America's increasing population, as well as those needed to replace the firetraps and antiquated structures.

The population figures, alone, show that we must increase the total number of classrooms, not to speak of enough classrooms to reduce class sizes and to replace obsolete structures.

When school resumes next month, nearly 35 million students will be in attendance in the primary and secondary schools.

This compares with 33½ million during the 1957-58 school year, which was an increase of 3.8 percent over the previous year.

Since 1948 the increase in pupil enrollment has been a staggering 35.9 percent.

By 1965 the experts expect more than 40 million pupils enrolled.

We have a clear choice.

We can permit today's and tomorrow's students to continue receiving a secondary education because of overcrowded or antiquated facilities.

Or we do something about it.

The amendment my colleagues and I offer today proposes to do something about it.

The amendment does not pretend to be a panacea for the Nation's present and future education problems. It does not pretend to solve the overall classroom shortage.

However, adoption of this amendment would provide us with an emergency program that will reduce the shortage significantly.

We present no startling new program of Federal aid.

Indeed, the principle of Federal aid in the education field is as old as our Republic. What is required now is solid implementation of this long-established principle.

I will not attempt, in these brief remarks, to trace the history of Federal education assistance in great detail, but a few highlights might be mentioned.

The Northwest Ordinance of 1785 specifically provided that "There shall be reserved the lot No. 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools within said township."

A similar ordinance of 1787 stated:

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

These ordinances led to the Land-Grant Act of 1862 which brought about the establishment of the land-grant colleges, such as Michigan State University and others.

Let us turn now to more modern times. In 1931 the National Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Hoover, had this to say:

From the Revolution to the Civil War, the Federal Government encouraged and financially aided education in the States. It endowed higher and common schools with lands, and made grants of surplus tax moneys; but it did not attempt to regulate the purposes, define the programs, supervise the teachings, or otherwise control education in the States.

There is no lack of evidence that there is a firmly established record of the Federal Government's right and responsibility to take an active interest in the promotion of education.

We can turn, for instance, to the famous GI bill, under which many thousands of our young citizens went to college under Federal grants.

Or the laws which provide construction and operating funds to areas which have an influx of federally connected children.

These are examples of how the Congress and the Federal Government have acted to provide assistance in specific circumstances.

What we need now is a broad program, a program that will really get at the heart of the education crisis. Such a program, to my mind, must start with Federal aid to the States for school construction.

Over the years congressional committees have held scores of hearings on education bills, producing volume after volume of testimony.

They all boil down to about the same conclusions: Federal assistance to the States for education purposes should be stepped up, and a good place to start is in classroom construction.

Congress is not the only place where this decision has been reached.

The same conclusions have been developed from the local school boards all the way up to the White House.

They are echoed by local parents' groups and national organizations.

Recently, the Detroit Council of Parent-Teachers Associations adopted a resolution calling on Congress to pass an urgently needed school-construction bill.

The American Parents Committee told us last December:

Between 56,000 and 65,000 new classrooms will be needed each year to take care of increased enrollments and replacement of obsolete and hazardous buildings. The Federal Government collects three-fourths of the country's tax money; it should share in meeting the expense of this emergency.

The APC deplors the defeat of the Federal aid for school construction bill in 1957 and believes that the next session of Congress must in some way help States to provide the classrooms needed for the education of the Nation's children.

This is the next session of Congress, and it is almost over.

This is our one chance this year, and our first chance in the Senate in many years, to act on a meaningful education program.

Mr. President, in his address this morning, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] quoted from a speech he delivered some 10 years ago to back up his arguments for the pending scholarship-loan bill.

I wonder if he would mind if I quoted from a speech he made less than 4 years ago to back up my arguments for my school construction amendment.

On January 6, 1955, in introducing a school construction bill, the distinguished Senator from Alabama told of the tremendous shortage of classrooms. He said:

The picture will grow blacker every year as the birthrate continues at record heights, as costs grow, and as teachers' salaries remain below adequate levels. New schools are needed throughout the Nation, both to meet the rising school population and to replace outworn or unsafe buildings.

People throughout America are demanding, rightfully, that Congress act to remedy these intolerable conditions. They are concerned not only with the well-being of the children themselves, but with the danger that our superiority in the struggle against Communist imperialism may be threatened by failure to maintain American brainpower to overbalance the Soviet bloc's massive manpower.

As of today, the Russians are outstripping us in engineering graduates, in scientific specialists, in the production of those skills essential to national strength and security. We dare not fall behind. We dare not neglect our elementary and secondary schools, where training of physicists, mathematicians, engineers, and other highly skilled and educated personnel must begin. We dare not neglect our institutions of higher learning. (From a statement by Senator HILL on the growing shortage of classrooms; delivered on January 6, 1955, when introducing S. 5, to provide \$500 million a year for school construction.)

Mr. President, I submit that the remarks made on that occasion by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, are even more pertinent today than they were when they were made in 1955 by this great American.

Mr. President, a moment ago I mentioned that the plea for Federal aid for

school construction has gone as high as the White House. I wish I could say that the President has been a firm and consistent fighter for a Federal aid construction bill; but I am afraid I cannot.

It was not until 1955, more than 2 years after he became President, that he asked Congress to adopt an education program that included Federal aid for school construction.

He took the same approach in his 1956 message. And in 1957, he said:

Of all the problems, one is most critical. In 1955, and again last year, I called attention to the critical shortage of classrooms in many communities across the country * * * I again urge the Congress to act quickly upon this pressing problem.

Yet, in 1958 the President dropped completely his support of a solution to this pressing problem of the classroom shortage.

I shall not dwell here on this tragic lack of conviction. I look upon it more in sadness than in anger.

But in referring to the White House, I should like to call attention to the findings of the White House Conference on Education, which took place late in 1955.

On the subject of Federal aid to schools, the report of the White House conference had this to say:

A substantial majority felt that some States do not have sufficient financial resources to take care of the essential needs of the schools.

The participants approved by a ratio of 2 to 1 the proposition that the Federal Government should increase its financial participation in public education. Of those favoring such increase, the overwhelming majority approved an increase in Federal funds for school-building construction.

The report ended with the following warning about financing education in the future:

The problem of financing our schools * * * is not lack of capacity to support education adequately. The problem is national determination to apply enough of our available resources to the job.

The people of America need urgently to re-examine the allocation of tax funds at all levels of Government. The destiny of our children and our free society demands that we use more of our wealth for education.

The recent Rockefeller Brothers Fund Report on Education notes that "all of the problems of the schools lead us back sooner or later to one basic problem—financing."

This thorough report objectively discusses the subject of Federal aid to the States for education, and it fails to find the fire-breathing monster called control lurking in the background.

It does lay down one general ground rule:

Federal funds should be used only to balance the serious gaps in the total national educational system—and should be given in such a manner as to encourage State and local governments to use their own resources—and where necessary to remove the barriers to use of their own resources.

Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with that ground rule, and I am sure my colleagues who support Federal aid do also.

We do not want the Federal Government to supplant State and local efforts in education. We do not desire to de-

prive the people of the school district and the State of their grave responsibilities.

We do wish to aid them in fulfilling these responsibilities.

Returning to the Rockefeller Report on Education, Mr. President, it notes that a popular form of Federal support for education is the scholarship program.

It says the scholarships involve a minimum hazard of Federal interference.

Then the report goes on to say:

Another much discussed form of Federal aid which involves a minimum of hazard to local initiative is funds for building construction.

In the years immediately ahead, great expansion of the physical plant will be required at every level of the educational system.

To the extent that the Federal Government can assist in this problem either through loans or outright grants, it will be engaging in one of the most helpful and least hazardous forms of support to education.

As I said earlier, many organizations have expressed themselves as firmly in favor of Federal aid to education.

I ask unanimous consent that a partial list of such national organizations be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

- American Association of School Administrators.
- American Association of University Professors.
- American Association of University Women.
- AFL-CIO.
- American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO).
- American Home Economics Association.
- American Institute of Architects.
- American Library Association.
- American Parents Committee.
- American Veterans Committee.
- American Veterans of World War II and Korea.
- American Vocational Association.
- Americans for Democratic Action.
- Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen (Ind.)
- Cooperative League of the USA.
- Council of Chief State School Officers.
- International Association for Childhood Education.
- Jewish War Veterans.
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
- National Association of Social Workers.
- National Child Labor Committee.
- National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
- National Consumers League.
- National Council of Jewish Women.
- National Education Association.
- National Farmers' Union.
- National Jewish Welfare Board.
- National School Boards Association.
- Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen (Ind.).
- Railway Labor Executives' Association.
- Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
- United Mine Workers (Ind.).

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, another list of organizations opposing Federal assistance probably will be entered in the RECORD at some point in the debate. It undoubtedly will be headed by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Manufacturers

Association, two organizations which steadfastly refuse to recognize the advent of the 20th century.

Their main argument is the scare tactic that Federal aid means Federal control. This unsupported argument has been knocked down so many times that one would think these organizations would be embarrassed to try it again. Yet they persist in presenting this strawman for a further mauling. It is not a new argument, but it is one the proponents have yet to sustain.

President Hoover's 1931 National Advisory Committee on Education dealt with it by stating:

The widely current notion that control of education follows any and all types of financial grants is not verified by experience.

That statement has been repeated in substantially the same form over all the years. We have recognized the existence of the fear these organizations have generated, however.

Section 102 of the scholarship bill before us states:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution.

This prohibition would apply equally to the school construction amendment which we are offering.

When the argument about Federal control falls on deaf ears, which it is increasingly, the opponents of Federal assistance cite the cost. They suggest that such a program will bankrupt, or nearly so, the Nation. Such an argument is absurd on the face of it. It is simply an excuse to undermine the Federal Government's responsibility to the States.

The school-construction program which we propose in this amendment would cost \$1 billion a year for each of 2 years. One billion dollars is a lot of money, and I have not become so mesmerized by the billions we deal with in this Congress that I fail to recognize that. However, let me point this out: Our annual budget for the fiscal year is about \$80 billion. Of this, about \$40 billion is for the national defense.

I will not argue that no one would notice another billion or so for school construction tucked into this gigantic budget, although that would not be a bad argument. Instead, I will argue that we should add this billion for school construction to the defense appropriations, because education is inescapably a part of our national defense.

In fact, I firmly believe that the proper education of our young people is

more important to our country than the biggest Army, Navy, or Air Force in the world. Education is defense, any way we look at it. If we can afford \$40 billion for defense, we certainly can afford the 41st billion for the same purpose: In fact, I do not see how we can afford not to spend it if our children and our hopes for their future and the country's future means anything to us.

I shall turn now to an outline of the specific amendment which we are offering. As I stated, it would provide \$1 billion a year for 2 years, to assist the States in school construction. The Federal funds would be made available to the States on the basis of their school-age population. The States would match the Federal contribution accepted under the program. During the 2-year program envisioned by the amendment, it is estimated that more than 105,000 classrooms could be built, significantly reducing the shortage.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the estimated allocations to each State, together with the number of estimated classrooms that could be constructed under my amendment, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated annual allocation to States under 2-year, \$2 billion school program

State or Territory	School-age children, 5 to 17 years, as of 1954 ¹	Annual allotment based on \$27.09 per child	Potential classrooms provided for, on a 50-50 matching basis ² per year	State or Territory	School-age children, 5 to 17 years, as of 1954 ¹	Annual allotment based on \$27.09 per child	Potential classrooms provided for, on a 50-50 matching basis ² per year
Total ³	36,919,000	\$1,000,000,000	52,632	New Jersey	1,046,000	\$28,330,910	1,491
Alabama	827,000	22,399,295	1,179	New Mexico	214,000	5,796,190	305
Arizona	234,000	6,337,890	333	New York	3,024,000	81,905,040	4,311
Arkansas	490,000	13,271,650	699	North Carolina	1,123,000	30,416,455	1,601
California	2,540,000	68,795,900	3,621	North Dakota	159,000	4,306,515	227
Colorado	333,000	9,019,305	475	Ohio	1,866,000	50,540,610	2,690
Connecticut	441,000	11,944,485	629	Oklahoma	527,000	14,273,745	751
Delaware	77,000	2,085,545	109	Oregon	359,000	9,723,515	512
Florida	703,000	19,040,755	1,002	Pennsylvania	2,315,000	62,691,775	3,299
Georgia	944,000	25,563,240	1,345	Rhode Island	164,000	4,441,940	234
Idaho	156,000	4,225,260	222	South Carolina	646,000	17,496,910	921
Illinois	1,867,000	50,567,695	2,661	South Dakota	159,000	4,306,515	227
Indiana	943,000	25,541,155	1,344	Tennessee	846,000	22,913,910	1,206
Iowa	592,000	16,034,320	844	Texas	2,027,000	54,901,295	2,889
Kansas	438,000	11,863,230	624	Utah	200,000	5,417,000	285
Kentucky	767,000	20,774,195	1,093	Vermont	89,000	2,410,565	127
Louisiana	746,000	20,205,410	1,063	Virginia	849,000	22,995,165	1,210
Maine	207,000	5,606,595	295	Washington	553,000	14,978,005	788
Maryland	572,000	15,492,620	815	West Virginia	530,000	14,355,050	755
Massachusetts	975,000	25,907,875	1,364	Wisconsin	806,000	21,830,510	1,149
Michigan	1,573,000	42,604,705	2,242	Wyoming	72,000	1,950,120	103
Minnesota	710,000	19,230,350	1,012	Alaska	23,000	622,955	33
Mississippi	600,000	16,251,000	855	District of Columbia	148,000	4,008,680	211
Missouri	846,000	22,913,910	1,259	Guam	11,000	297,935	16
Montana	147,000	3,981,495	209	Hawaii	130,000	3,521,050	185
Nebraska	297,000	8,044,245	423	Puerto Rico	718,000	19,447,030	1,023
Nevada	43,000	1,164,655	61	Virgin Islands	8,000	216,680	11
New Hampshire	118,000	3,196,030	168				

¹ Figures for Alaska, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as of April 1, 1950. Later figures not available.

² On the basis of an average cost of \$38,000 per classroom. Figure would vary slightly depending on regions.

³ Items do not total, due to rounding of figures.

Mr. McNAMARA. The amendment which we are offering specifically provides that full control of the funds would be handled by the States through their educational agencies. While the overall program would be administered by the Commissioner of Education, his influence over how the funds are spent would be at an absolute minimum. And, as I stated earlier, the prohibition against Federal interference in the State educational sys-

tems, as spelled out in S. 4237, would apply equally to my amendment.

In closing I should like to repeat that I think the scholarship bill is a thoughtfully worked out program to assist in the higher levels of education. I, of course, support this legislation. However, I think I speak for all the cosponsors of this amendment when I say that it falls far short of what we might desire in this critical area. Our amendment is,

essentially, an emergency program, one designed to help meet a critical and immediate problem.

I urge most sincerely that it be adopted.

Mr. President, I wish to add only a few words. I think the phrase "survival of the fittest" originated about the turn of the century with some English statesman, but it was repeated approximately in 1913 by a great Sunday school teacher

in New York, a man named John D. Rockefeller. He made the phrase "survival of the fittest" more well known when he used it in a Sunday school class to indicate there was nothing immoral about the operation of big business in this country, that it was a question of survival of the fittest. I think we should have this phrase in mind today when we talk about education, for education really is a contest of survival of the fittest, a struggle for the minds of men in the world in which we live. I am sure we are going to see to it that our children, since they must compete with the rest of the world, are the fittest.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to thank my colleagues who joined with me in sponsoring the school construction amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be added to the list of cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend and cosponsor of the amendment, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Michigan for the leadership he has shown in this matter. The Senator has fought for this measure throughout the years ever since he came to the United States Senate. I had the pleasure of serving with the Senator from Michigan for a period of time in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I know how devoted he is to the cause. He deserves the thanks of all friends of education in this country for his work.

I noticed under the terms of the proposed legislation that with the \$2 billion of Federal money in 2 years, plus the \$2 billion of State and local money for construction, there would be a total of approximately \$4 billion.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has said that amount of money would build at least 105,000 classrooms.

Mr. McNAMARA. According to the most recent estimates, that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the architects will be sufficiently simple and yet adequate in their planning so that with that amount of money it will be possible to build at least 120,000 classrooms. I think there is frequently a tendency for architects to be too lavish in their plans. Even on the basis of 105,000 classrooms, since between 30 and 35 students can use a classroom, the result would be classroom space for a total of from 3.1 million to 3.6 million students, who would be thereby given adequate facilities. Is that correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct.

I will say to the Senator from Illinois it was a pleasure for me to work with him on the Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare, which wrestles with educational programs.

The recent figures, which are generally accepted by educators, show that the classroom cost is \$38,000. That is the cost for a single classroom, and my estimate of the number of classrooms that can be built under my amendment is based on that figure.

The Senator indicates there are too many instances when there is too much plush or too much gingerbread, or whatever one may desire to call it, put into the classrooms. I think there is less and less of that every year. Classrooms are now becoming functional to such a degree that in some communities where schools are being built the residents accuse the members of the board of education of not being good neighbors because of the type of school buildings which are being constructed in residential areas.

It is possible to go overboard on that item. I do not think we ought to condemn the architects too much, because if we push them too far we will have children attending schools in factory-type buildings. I am sure the Senator from Illinois would be the last one to be associated with that kind of program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to have this word of reassurance from the Senator from Michigan. If and when the bill is passed I hope the architects will take notice, because I think the costs of hospital construction have been skyrocketed excessively, and I have noticed a similar tendency in some parts of the United States with respect to school construction.

Is it not true that there are now about 4 million students who are either on part time or are going to school in grossly defective school buildings?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct. The figures for the Nation as a whole are constantly increasing. That situation is really alarming.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The emergency program which the Senator from Michigan is advocating would really help us make up for the arrearage in school construction.

Mr. McNAMARA. It would not even completely cover that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. McNAMARA. It would go a long way toward meeting the deficiency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The arrears in school construction accumulated, did they not, because of the fact that during the depression the localities did not have money with which to construct school buildings, and thereafter came the great war, when other needs were urgent and had priority over school construction?

Mr. McNAMARA. They were not only urgent, but proper, I would say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. We all recognize we could not use materials for the building of schools which were needed for the war effort. First we had to win the war.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Federal Government became a part of the problem at that point, if there was any question

about it being partly responsible prior to that time, and I do not think there was.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, from 1930 to about 1946 there was very little school construction.

Mr. McNAMARA. It was prohibited largely because of the war.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, therefore, the school plant of the country became more and more obsolete.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There was some increase in school enrollment in that time.

Mr. McNAMARA. There was quite a rapid increase in the latter part of the period.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Beginning in about 1940 or 1941, the birthrate took a big jump.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The birthrate has continued to increase, by and large, since then.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the number of children who go to schools has swollen into a regular torrent. Is that not true?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator describes it very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even if we were keeping up now with the current rate of inflow, which would be a terrific effort, we would still have the arrearage to make good.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that schoolchildren are now going to school for a greater number of years than they used to? Years ago high-school education was for the minority. Now, high-school education is for the vast majority. Therefore, there is an increasing need for the construction of high-school buildings. Is that not correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is certainly correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true there would be some indirect benefit to education aside from school construction, because in certain localities if the Federal Government met half of the cost of construction some funds would be released for teachers' salaries, for books, and for other things?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct. The Senator stresses the point I mentioned in my speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So it is a blood transfusion into an overtaxed and financially starved educational system.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Michigan for his ability, his energy, and the way he has tackled the whole problem.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I promised to yield to the Senator from Oregon next, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for

yielding to me. I point out that the leadership which the Senator from Michigan has demonstrated in the field of education bears out what was said to me 4 years ago by our Oregon chancellor of education, Dr. John R. Richards, who is seated in the gallery today. When I first came to the Senate in January 1955, when, I believe, the Senator from Michigan also took the oath of office, Chancellor Richards told me that one of the genuine leaders in the field of education was Senator PATRICK V. McNAMARA. I believe Chancellor Richards and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, then Mr. McNamara, were associated at Wayne University and in other educational enterprises in the great city of Detroit.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is true. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to the fact that my good friend Dr. Richards is in the gallery. I want to see him before he leaves Washington.

Mr. NEUBERGER. He knew that the speech of the Senator from Michigan would bear out the indications of leadership shown by the Senator from Michigan in the many enterprises in which they worked together in the State of Michigan.

The Senator from Michigan has performed a service to the whole country, particularly future generations of Americans, by making it possible for the Senate to vote on the issue of whether or not we shall do something, not only for higher education, which—as the Senator has stressed—is very important, but also for those entering the elementary schools and high schools of the Nation.

After all, a structure is only as sound as its foundation. The foundation of our great colleges and universities rests in the kindergartens, the grade schools, and the high schools of America.

I think it is significant that the New York Times of yesterday states editorially that the measure which came to us from the House—does not say anything about Federal aid for school construction, a program that the administration dropped this year; but one that must and will be revived in the new Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times of yesterday, August 12, 1958, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID TO THE SCHOOLS

Having waited almost to the last minute for the House to act, the Senate will now doubtless put through its own education bill very speedily. We hope it will be a better bill than the one passed 4 days ago by the House.

Inadequate though it is, especially in view of the fact that all scholarship funds were eliminated, the House bill is still much better than nothing. If the Senate insists on some scholarship money, and makes other improvements, a quite acceptable measure can come out of conference committee and be adopted by both Houses before the on-rushing adjournment. In that case the 85th Congress will have made a modest but definite contribution to relieving the educational crisis that has been afflicting our country for years—long before sputnik was ever heard of.

Although bereft of scholarship funds as it passed the House, the measure does provide some \$900 million in various forms of educational aid over a 4-year period. One of the ways it does so is through grants to stimulate testing and guidance programs. Another is through the useful device of long-term, low-interest loans to needy students. This provision for Federal assistance may stimulate a new interest in locally operated nonprofit guidance and scholarship loan programs, such as the successful one that has existed in Dallas for over a decade. The House bill also provides for graduate fellowships, for grants to the States to strengthen mathematics, science and language teaching in the schools, and for research and experimentation in the use of mass media for educational purposes. In all these areas the bill may furnish a stimulus to State and local action as well.

The pending measure does not say anything about Federal aid for school construction, a program that the administration dropped this year; but one that must and will be revived in the new Congress.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Michigan has moved ahead of the New York Times chronologically, and he has revived the subject in this session of Congress, rather than waiting for the next session.

The Senator from Michigan pointed out in his very able address that Federal aid to schools is certainly justified from the standpoint of finance. I think one of his best expressions was:

If we can afford \$40 billion for defense, we certainly can afford the 41st billion for the same purpose.

He had already pointed out in his brilliant speech that education is defense.

Is it not true that almost every forward step in the field of education in this country has been resisted and denounced? When the Morrill Act was passed in 1862, in the administration of Abraham Lincoln, by which act land grants were to be used by the Federal Government to encourage land-grant colleges, the denunciation of that act was far more severe than the criticism today with relation to Federal aid in school construction.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is true. The arguments were almost the same as those used today. If we go back to the birth of the public-school system, we would find similar resistance all through our history.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that the local property tax in many areas has broken down as an adequate means of supporting necessary school construction and necessary educational operations?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct, but despite that, we are insisting, in the amendment we propose, that the States provide 50 percent of the funds, which will be matched with Federal funds. We know that it is a tremendous load to put on the States, but that is as far as we could hope to go at this time in our history.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I recognize that the Senator from Michigan regards this measure as an introductory measure, to write into legislation the principle that the Federal Government has a responsibility at the very beginning of the educational process.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that

every child is a citizen, not only of Michigan, Oregon, Illinois, or South Carolina, but essentially of the United States?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is certainly so; and it is the responsibility of every citizen to educate every child, regardless of the State in which he may go to school.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Federal Government can levy on the child's life if there is an emergency, and send him to the far corners of the world to help defend the United States, as has been done several times during our lifetime.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is true; and a certain amount of education is required in order for a person to be eligible to serve his country. Certainly it is a national problem, as the Senator says.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Has not the Federal Government some genuine obligation to see to it that a child, while growing up and maturing, has an education adequate to enable him to encounter the storms and vicissitudes of life?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time which the Senator from Michigan allotted himself has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram in support of Federal aid to education generally, which I have received from a number of outstanding educational leaders in the State of Oregon, associated with the Oregon Education Association.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, July 2, 1958.

Hon. Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

The voters of several communities in Oregon recently rejected proposed school budgets, thereby jeopardizing the established school program of the respective communities. A cause of the defeat of these tax elections was heavy local property taxes.

This morning the 85 Oregon delegates to the NEA convention in Cleveland unanimously reaffirmed their conviction that Federal aid to education will provide the only solution to pressing State school finance problems.

We strongly urge your continued support of the Thompson school construction bill (H. R. 12085) and the Murray-Metcalf bills (S. 3311, H. R. 10763) which would appropriate Federal funds to the States for use by local school districts for construction and for supplementing the salaries of teachers in public schools. Oregon's schools need the aid proposed in these measures.

These bills adequately safeguard State and local control of education since State authorities would allocate and supervise use of these funds.

MARTHA SHULL,
Past President, National Education Association.

TOM POWERS,
President, Oregon Education Association.
CLARENCE HINES,
President, Oregon Association of School Administrators.

EWALD TURNER,
President, National Department of Classroom Teachers.

LOUIS CORRIGAN,
President, Oregon Department of Classroom Teachers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself such additional time as may be necessary to enable me to yield to the Senator from Texas, and also to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I divulge no secret when I say to the Senator from Michigan that he and I are more aware, perhaps, than any other Members of this body of the number of subjects upon which we disagree. But there is one thing as to which we have no disagreement and that is the devotion of the Senator from Michigan to the cause of education.

He has been diligent. He has been effective. A few days ago I said in this Chamber that I did not want the Senate to adjourn, and that it would not adjourn if it followed any suggestions I might make, until it had passed an effective education bill.

The committee of which the distinguished Senator from Michigan is an able member has been working on a bill for several months. It promptly reported the bill to this body. That bill does not go as far or as fast as many Members think it should, but I would not want the Senator to conclude the very able address he is making without affording me an opportunity to say to him, as sincerely as I know how, that in my opinion perhaps we would not have had any kind of education bill except for his constant prodding all the year long. The first letter I received from any Member of the Senate on this subject during this session was from the Senator from Michigan. In that letter he pointed out the absolute necessity for our taking prompt action in the field of education. He pointed to the great strides the Soviet Union had made. He pointed to the startling revelations which had been brought out in the Preparedness Subcommittee hearings. He not only urged that we provide a program such as has been recommended by the committee, but that we provide a much stronger program, such as he has offered in his own amendment.

While I do not agree with all his conclusions, I do bear testimony to his great interest, to his devotion, to his dedication, and to the great service he has rendered in this particular field. As I stated earlier, I believe that when the history of this generation is written we shall stand or fall by what we did, and when we did it, so far as the field of education in this country is concerned.

I believe it is later than we think. I am very proud that the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and other members of the committee, without regard to partisanship on either side of the aisle, have brought to the Senate an education bill. While I may not agree with the Senator from Michigan on some of its provisions and some of its amendments, I do say that we would probably have had no bill at all except for his persistence and insistence. I pay tribute to him for it.

While I am on my feet, and with the indulgence of the Senator from Michigan, I wish to thank my friend from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and to tell him how much I appreciate his loyalty to this cause and his cooperation in acting in behalf of the national interest whenever I have had occasion to call upon him.

Mr. McNAMARA. I should like to respond to the majority leader by saying that he stresses too much our disagreement. I believe we are largely in agreement on aid to education. I have heard the distinguished majority leader publicly make it an important part of his program. I know of his sincerity. I believe we have much more in common than we have in conflict when the chips are down.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. One of the proudest periods of my life was when I was a teacher in a small sixth grade school. There is no satisfaction which is greater than that which comes from seeing one's work in the classroom bear fruit.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the majority leader for the very kind expressions about my small contribution and feeble efforts in this field.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the majority leader for what he said a moment ago. I should like to join in the remarks made this morning by the Senator from Montana and other Senators in congratulating the majority leader for the masterly way in which he has conducted himself during the sessions of Congress. I have derived great personal happiness and pride in being able to work with him in a bipartisan way for those things which belong to us as American, not as Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator from South Carolina and I serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. As is true with respect to the Senator from Texas, the Senator from South Carolina and I do not always see exactly eye to eye with each other, but I recognize his interest in the problem we are considering and his devotion to the committee from which the pending bill has come to the Senate. I am glad to yield to the Senator at this time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his kindness in yielding to me. I should like to ask the Senator a few questions: Is it not true that this bill, although it purports to be a bill for the purpose of promoting the national defense, is, in actuality, a general Federal aid to education bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. I believe the bill provides general Federal aid to education, which is certainly a part of national defense; yes.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator for his frankness in admitting that it is a bill of general Federal aid to education.

Mr. McNAMARA. I believe it is.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not correct to say that under the pending bill,

neither the school program nor the student loan program is limited in any way to persons undertaking a course of study considered to be critical to our national defense?

Mr. McNAMARA. I believe, as was brought out in the consideration of the bill in committee, that instruction in mathematics, science, languages, or anything else, is in the interest of the national defense. I agree with the discussions we had in the committee to that end.

Mr. THURMOND. Under the bill, a student could pursue studies in social welfare, automobile driving, flower arrangement, horse breeding, or tap dancing; is that not correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is not correct. The program will be administered by a director in the Department of Education. I am sure that any logical interpretation of the proposed legislation would preclude any such use of funds. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I promised my good friend from New York who must leave—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. I will yield myself an additional 5 minutes, so that I may yield to the Senator from New York. I understand that the Senator from South Carolina has made some reservation to speak on his own time. I hope the Senator will not take further of our time on the amendment. I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] wishes to speak on it also.

Mr. THURMOND. I wanted to ask some questions of the distinguished Senator. I should like to have him point out in the bill any limitation on courses which a recipient of a scholarship or a loan would be confronted with if he were awarded such a scholarship or loan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I shall be glad to go into it on the Senator's own time. We are limited in time. At this point I should like to yield to the Senator from New York, who must leave by plane for Europe later this afternoon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am with the Senator from Michigan on the amendment which he has offered for school construction. I have had very profound concern about the per capita formula which is contained in his amendment. In New York it would work out very advantageously for us. I believe, however, that we could minimize the cost to the Federal Government by inserting a formula which is based more on inability of a State to supply its own needs.

I realize that whenever one tries to get a result, one must yield some points in order to get most support. Hence I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I wish to express my appreciation to him; also, the appreciation of a great number of people in my State. I express appreciation for his giving us an opportunity, by marshaling the support which he has marshaled, to support a school construction amendment.

I had planned to take an airplane at 7 o'clock out of New York. I am now trying to arrange a somewhat later departure, so anxious am I to vote on his amendment.

Finally, I should like to say that the two things which I believe represent the clearest indices of competition between ourselves and the Soviet Union are housing and schools. It seems to me, therefore, that we are showing the whole free world this example of school construction which urgently needs—and I believe the Senator from Michigan can prove this beyond peradventure—Federal aid in order to do a really good job.

In that respect, I should like to ask the Senator a question. He has said frankly, as is the Senator's manner, that this is a Federal aid to schools bill. Is it not true, also, that in the really vital definition of the term security—the security which comes from a satisfied and educated people, the security which comes from an adequate number of teachers, and which comes from the skills which a population learns by education, such security as the Russians themselves are showing by their fantastic progress in 30-odd years, largely because of education—this is quite justifiably a national security bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. I certainly agree. I will be glad to have the Senator from New York cosponsor my amendment, which he has endorsed. I know of the problems which exist in the States to which he makes reference. Actually, the financially poor schools are not restricted to certain States or areas. It is the needy school districts that count. We have them throughout the entire United States. There are poor school districts in the rich States, because they surround an industrial area. There are commercial areas where such districts are referred to as "bedroom communities," where only residential taxes support community activities and the school district. Those are truly poor school districts, whether they are located north, south, east, or west. It is a national problem. This is in defense of my formula in the bill.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 12, 1958, the President, had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 3307. An act to reinstate certain terminated oil and gas leases;

S. 3778. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes; and

S. 3916. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nomin-

ations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THIRD SPECIAL EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD the outstanding address given by the President of the United States today at the Third Special Emergency General Assembly of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE THIRD SPECIAL EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, AUGUST 13, 1958*

It has been almost 5 years since I had the honor of addressing this Assembly. I then spoke of atomic power and urged that we should find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man should not be dedicated to his death but consecrated to his life. Since then great strides have been taken in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Tragically little has been done to eliminate the use of atomic and nuclear power for weapons purposes.

That is danger.

That danger in turn gives rise to another danger—the danger that nations under aggressive leadership will seek to exploit man's horror of war by confronting the nations, particularly small nations, with an apparent choice between supine surrender, or war.

This tactic reappeared during the recent Near East crisis.

Some might call it "ballistic blackmail."

In most communities it is illegal to cry "fire" in a crowded assembly. Should it not be considered serious international misconduct to manufacture a general war scare in an effort to achieve local political aims?

Pressures such as these will never be successfully practiced against America, but they do create dangers which could affect each and every one of us. That is why I have asked for the privilege of again addressing you.

The immediate reason is two small countries—Lebanon and Jordan.

The cause is one of universal concern.

The lawful and freely elected Government of Lebanon, feeling itself endangered by civil strife fomented from without, sent the United States a desperate call for instant help. We responded to that call.

On the basis of that response an effort has been made to create a war hysteria. The impression is sought to be created that if small nations are assisted in their desire to survive, that endangers the peace.

This is truly an upside-down portrayal. If it is made an international crime to help a small nation maintain its independence, then indeed the possibility of conquest are unlimited. We will have nullified the provision of our Charter which recognizes the inherent right of collective self-defense. We will have let loose forces that could generate great disasters.

The United Nations has, of course, a primary responsibility to maintain not only international peace but also security. That is an important fact. But, we must not evade a second fact, namely, that in the circumstances of the world since 1945, the United Nations has sometimes been blocked in its attempt to fulfill that function.

Respect for the liberty and freedom of all nations has always been a guiding principle of the United States. This respect has been consistently demonstrated by our unswerving adherence to the principles of the Charter, particularly in its opposition to aggression, direct or indirect. Sometimes we have made that demonstration in terms of collective measures called for by the United Nations. Sometimes we have done so pursuant to what the Charter calls the inherent right of collective self-defense.

I recall the moments of clear danger we have faced since the end of the Second World War—Iran, Greece, and Turkey, the Berlin blockade, Korea, the Straits of Taiwan.

A common principle guided the position of the United States on all of these occasions. That principle was that aggression, direct or indirect, must be checked before it gathered sufficient momentum to destroy us all—aggressor and defender alike.

It was this principle that was applied once again when the urgent appeals of the Governments of Lebanon and Jordan were answered.

I would be less than candid if I did not tell you that the United States reserves, within the spirit of the Charter, the right to answer the legitimate appeal of any nation, particularly small nations.

I doubt that a single free government in all the world would willingly forego the right to ask for help if its sovereignty were imperiled.

But I must again emphasize that the United States seeks always to keep within the spirit of the Charter.

Thus, when President Truman responded in 1947 to the urgent plea of Greece, the United States stipulated that our assistance would be withdrawn whenever the United Nations felt that its action could take the place of ours.

Similarly, when the United States responded to the urgent plea of Lebanon, we went at once to the Security Council and sought United Nations assistance for Lebanon so as to permit the withdrawal of United States forces.

United Nations action would have been taken, the United States forces already withdrawn, had it not been that 2 resolutions, 1 proposed by the United States, the other proposed by the Government of Japan, failed to pass because of 1 negative vote—a veto.

But nothing that I have said is to be construed as indicating that I regard the status quo as sacrosanct. Change is indeed the law of life and progress. But when change reflects the will of the people, then change can and should be brought about in peaceful ways.

In this context the United States respects the right of every Arab nation of the Near East to live in freedom without domination from any source, far or near.

In the same context, we believe that the Charter of the United Nations places on all of us certain solemn obligations. Without respect for each other's sovereignty and the exercise of great care in the means by which new patterns of international life are achieved, the projection of the peaceful vision of the Charter would become a mockery.

Let me turn now specifically to the problem of Lebanon.

When the United States military assistance began moving into Lebanon, I reported to the American people that we had immediately reacted to the plea of Lebanon because the situation was such that only prompt action would suffice.

I repeat to you the solemn pledge I then made: Our assistance to Lebanon has but one single purpose—that is the purpose of

the Charter and of such historic resolutions of the United Nations as the essentials for peace resolution of 1949 and the peace through deeds resolution of 1950. These denounce, as a form of aggression and as an international crime, the fomenting of civil strife in the interest of a foreign power.

We want to prevent that crime—or at least prevent its having fatal consequences. We have no other purpose whatsoever.

The United States troops will be totally withdrawn whenever this is requested by the duly constituted Government of Lebanon or whenever, through action by the United Nations or otherwise, Lebanon is no longer exposed to the original danger.

It is my earnest hope that this Assembly, free of the veto, will consider how it can assure the continued independence and integrity of Lebanon, so that the political destiny of the Lebanese people will continue to lie in their own hands.

The United States delegation will support measures to this end.

III

Another urgent problem is Jordan.

If we do not act promptly in Jordan a further dangerous crisis may result, for the method of indirect aggression discernible in Jordan may lead to conflicts endangering the peace.

We must recognize that peace in this area is fragile, and we must also recognize that the end of peace in Jordan could have consequences of a far-reaching nature. The United Nations has a particular responsibility in this matter, since it sponsored the Palestine Armistice Agreements upon which peace in the area rests and since it also sponsors the care of the Palestine refugees.

I hope this Assembly will be able to give expression to the interest of the United Nations in preserving the peace in Jordan.

IV

There is another matter which this Assembly should face in seeking to promote stability in the Near East. That is the question of inflammatory propaganda. The United Nations Assembly has on three occasions—in 1947, 1949, and 1950—passed resolution designed to stop the projecting of irresponsible broadcasts from one nation into the homes of citizens of other nations, thereby "fomenting civil strife and subverting the will of the people in any State." We all know that these resolutions have recently been violated in many directions in the Near East.

If we, the United States, have been at fault we stand ready to be corrected.

I believe that this Assembly should reaffirm its enunciated policy and should consider means for monitoring the radio broadcasts directed across national frontiers in the troubled Near East area and for examining complaints from these nations which consider their national security jeopardized by external propaganda.

V

The countries of this area should also be freed from armed pressure and infiltration coming across their borders. When such interference threatens they should be able to get from the United Nations prompt and effective action to help safeguard their independence. This requires that adequate machinery be available to make the United Nations presence manifest in the area of trouble.

Therefore I believe this Assembly should take action looking toward the creation of a standby United Nations peace force. The need for such a force in being is clearly demonstrated by recent events involving imminent danger to the integrity of two of our members.

I understand that this general subject is to be discussed at the 13th General Assembly and that our distinguished Secretary

General has taken an initiative in this matter. Recent events clearly demonstrate that this is a matter for urgent and positive action.

VI

I have proposed four areas of action for the consideration of the Assembly—in respect to Lebanon, Jordan, subversive propaganda, and a standby United Nations force. These measures, basically, are designed to do one thing: to preserve the right of a nation and its people to determine their own destiny, consistent with the obligation to respect the rights of others.

This clearly applies to the great surge of Arab nationalism.

Let me state the position of my country unmistakably. The peoples of the Arab nations of the Near East clearly possess the right of determining and expressing their own destiny. Other nations should not interfere so long as this expression is found in ways compatible with international peace and security.

However, here as in other areas we have an opportunity to share in a great international task. That is the task of assisting the peoples of that area, under programs which they may desire, to make further progress toward the goals of human welfare they have set. Only on the basis of progressing economies can truly independent governments sustain themselves.

This is a real challenge to the Arab people and to us all.

To help the Arab countries fulfill these aspirations, here is what I propose:

First, That consultations be immediately undertaken by the Secretary General with the Arab nations of the Near East to ascertain whether an agreement can be reached to establish an Arab development institution on a regional basis.

Second, That these consultations consider the composition and the possible functions of a regional Arab development institution, whose task would be to accelerate progress in such fields as industry, agriculture, water supply, health, and education.

Third, Other nations and private organizations which might be prepared to support this institution should also be consulted at an appropriate time.

Should the Arab States agree on the usefulness of such a soundly organized regional institution, and should they be prepared to support it with their own resources, the United States would also be prepared to support it.

The institution would be set up to provide loans to the Arab States as well as the technical assistance required in the formulation of development projects.

The institution should be governed by the Arab States themselves.

This proposal for a regional Arab development institution can, I believe, be realized on a basis which would attract international capital, both public and private.

I also believe that the best and quickest way to achieve the most desirable result would be for the Secretary-General to make two parallel approaches. First to consult with the Arab States of the Near East to determine an area of agreement. Then to invite the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which has vast experience in this field, to make available its facilities for the planning of the organizational and operating techniques needed to establish the institution on a progressive course.

I hope it is clear that I am not suggesting a position of leadership for my own country in the work of creating such an institution. If this institution is to be a success, the function of leadership must belong to the Arab States themselves.

I would hope that high on the agenda of this institution would be action to meet

one of the major challenges of the Near East, the great common shortage—water.

Much scientific and engineering work is already under way in the field of water development. For instance, atomic isotopes now permit us to chart the course of the great underground rivers. And new horizons are opening in the desalting of water. The ancient problem of water is on the threshold of solution. Energy, determination, and science will carry it over that threshold.

Another great challenge facing the area is disease.

Already there is substantial effort among the peoples and governments of the Near East to conquer disease and disability. But much more remains to be done.

The United States is prepared to join with other governments and the World Health Organization in an all-out, joint attack on preventable disease in the Near East.

But to see the desert blossom again and preventable disease conquered is only a first step. As I look into the future I see the emergence of modern Arab States that would bring to this century contributions surpassing those we cannot forget from the past. We remember that Western arithmetic and algebra owe much to Arabic mathematicians and that much of the foundation of the world's medical science and astronomy was laid by Arab scholars. Above all, we remember that three of the world's great religions were born in the Near East.

But a true Arab renaissance can only develop in a healthy human setting. Material progress should not be an overriding objective in itself; but it is an important condition for achieving higher human, cultural, and spiritual objectives.

But I repeat, if this vision of the modern Arab community is to come to life, the goals must be Arab goals.

VII

With the assistance of the United Nations, the countries of the Near East now have a unique opportunity to advance, in freedom, their security and their political and economic interests. If a plan for peace of the kind I am proposing can be carried forward, in a few short years we may be able to look back on the Lebanon and Jordan crises as the beginning of a great new era of Arab history.

But there is an important consideration which must remain in mind today and in the future, if there is an end to external interference in the internal affairs of the Arab States of the Near East; if an adequate United Nations Peace Force is in existence ready for call by countries fearful for their security; if a regional development institution exists and is at work on the basic projects and programs designed to lift the living standards of the area, supported by friendly aid from abroad and governed by the Arab States themselves; then with this good prospect, and indeed as a necessary condition for its fulfillment, I hope and believe that the nations of the area, intellectually and emotionally, will no longer feel the need to seek national security through spiraling military buildups which lead not only to economic impotence but to war.

Perhaps the nations involved in the 1948 hostilities may, as a first step, wish to call for a United Nations study of the flow of heavy armaments to those nations. My country would be glad to support the establishment of an appropriate United Nations body to examine this problem. This body would discuss it individually with these countries and see what arms control arrangements could be worked out under which the security of all these nations could be maintained more effectively than under a continued wasteful, dangerous competition in armaments. I recognize that any

such arrangements must reflect these countries' own views.

VIII

I have tried to present to you the framework of a plan for peace in the Near East which would provide a setting of political order responsive to the rights of the people in each nation; which would avoid the dangers of a regional arms race; which would permit the peoples of the Near East to devote their energies wholeheartedly to the tasks of development and human progress in the widest sense.

It is important that the six elements of this program be viewed as a whole. They are:

1. United Nations concern for Lebanon.
2. United Nations measures to preserve peace in Jordan.
3. An end to the fomenting from without of civil strife.
4. A United Nations peace force.
5. A regional economic development plan to assist and accelerate improvement in the living standards of the people in these Arab nations.
6. Steps to avoid a new arms race spiral in the area.

To have solidity, the different elements of this plan for peace and progress should be considered and acted on together, as integral elements of a single concerted effort.

Therefore, I hope that this Assembly will seek simultaneously to set in motion measures that would create a climate of security in the Near East consonant with the principles of the United Nations Charter, and at the same time create the framework for a common effort to raise the standard of living of the Arab peoples.

IX

But the peoples of the Near East are not alone in their ambition for independence and development. We are living in a time when the whole world has become alive to the possibilities for modernizing their societies.

The American Government has been steadily enlarging its allocations to foreign economic development in response to these worldwide hopes. We have joined in partnership with such groupings as the Organization of American States and the Colombo plan; and we are working on methods to strengthen these regional arrangements. For example, in the case of the Organization of American States, we are consulting with our sister republics of this hemisphere to strengthen its role in economic development. And the Government of the United States has not been alone in supporting development efforts. The British Commonwealth, the countries of Western Europe, and Japan have all made significant contributions.

But in many parts of the world both geography and wise economic planning favor national rather than regional development programs. The United States will, of course, continue its firm support of such national programs. Only where the desire for a regional approach is clearly manifested and where the advantage of regional over national is evident will the United States change to regional methods.

The United States is proud of the scope and variety of its development activities throughout the world. Those who know our history will realize that this is no sudden, new policy of my Government. Ever since its birth, the United States has gladly shared its wealth with others. This it has done without thought of conquest or economic domination. After victory in two world wars and the expenditure of vast treasure there is no world map, either geographic or economic, on which anyone can find that the force of American arms or the power of the American Treasury has ab-

sorbed any foreign land or political or economic system. As we cherish our freedom, we believe in freedom for others.

X

The thing I have talked about today are real and await our grasp. Within the Near East and within this Assembly are the forces of good sense, restraint, and wisdom to make, with time and patience, a framework of political order and of peace in that region.

But we also know that all these possibilities are shadowed, all our hopes are dimmed, by the fact of the arms race in nuclear weapons—a contest which drains off our best talents and vast resources, straining the nerves of all our peoples.

As I look out on this Assembly, with so many of you representing new nations, one thought above all impresses me.

The world that is being remade on our planet is going to be a world of many mature nations. As one after another of these new nations moves through the difficult transition to modernization and learns the methods of growth, from this travail new levels of prosperity and productivity will emerge.

This world of individual nations is not going to be controlled by any one power or group of powers. This world is not going to be committed to any one ideology.

Please believe me when I say that the dream of world domination by one power or of world conformity is an impossible dream.

The nature of today's weapons, the nature of modern communications, and the widening circle of new nations make it plain that we must, in the end, be a world community of open societies.

And the concept of the open society is the ultimate key to a system of arms control we can all trust.

We must, then, seek with new vigor, new initiative, the path to a peace based on the effective control of armaments, on economic advancement and on the freedom of all peoples to be ruled by governments of their choice. Only thus can we exercise the full capacity God has given us to enrich the lives of the individual human beings who are our ultimate concern, our responsibility and our strength.

In this memorable task there lies enough work and enough reward to satisfy the energies and ambitions of all leaders, everywhere.

ENDORSEMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the reason which I have heretofore given, I ask unanimous consent that the legislative clerk may read an address prepared by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright].

There being no objection, the Legislative Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the American Banker of Wednesday, August 13, has a story entitled "Citizens and Southern Becomes First Bank in United States To Invest in SBA Corporation—\$325,000 Approved."

The story refers to an announcement by the president of the Citizens & Southern National Bank of Georgia that it will invest in the organization of a small business investment company under the provisions of S. 3651.

This is a bill which just passed both Houses of Congress and is awaiting the signature of the President and which, when enacted, will be known as the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

I believe this announcement by a very prominent financial institution of the south will be of general interest, indicating that able financial leaders in the State of Georgia consider this bill to be one which will be practicable and workable and of great benefit to small business generally. I am very proud of the fact that as chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency I had a part in the enactment of this legislation which has been advocated for many years by some of the most knowledgeable persons in this field. I hope the President will sign the bill promptly.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news article about the action of the Citizens and Southern Bank.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS AND SOUTHERN BECOMES FIRST BANK IN UNITED STATES TO INVEST IN SBA CORPORATION—\$325,000 APPROVED

SAVANNAH, GA.—An important boost to Georgia small business was announced today by Mills B. Lane, president of the Citizens and Southern National Bank. The directors, meeting here, authorized investment of \$325,000 in capital in a new Georgia corporation to be sponsored by Citizens and Southern, formed for the purpose of providing venture capital for small and expanding business.

The step was believed to be the first definite action in the Nation to be taken under the terms of the Small Investment Act of 1958, passed last Thursday by Congress, and now awaiting President Eisenhower's signature. Under the law, the Small Business Administration is authorized to match private funds invested in development corporations formed by 10 or more individuals.

The law also authorized Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. insured banks to invest an amount equal to 1 percent of their capital in such development corporations.

In addition to the \$325,000 to be invested in the new corporation by Citizens and Southern National Bank, \$115,000 more will be sought from interested individuals or corporations in Georgia, plus \$60,000 from Citizens and Southern affiliate banks in Georgia. This will bring the total private investment to \$500,000 and the total initial funds to approximately \$1 million, including the participation in the form of loans and investments from the Small Business Administration.

James F. Hollingsworth, regional SBA director in Atlanta, already has been advised of the new group's plan to form a corporation under the provision of the new bill.

PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

According to Mr. Lane, purposes of the development corporation will be as follows:

1. To provide a pool venture capital for small businesses which will enable them to secure bank credit.
2. To assist small business so there will be no necessity for them to seek direct Government help.
3. To provide a revolving pool of capital where expanding or new business can obtain capital and management assistance until they can travel on their own.
4. To provide a clearing house for bringing together individual investors and businesses seeking capital.
5. To highlight, emphasize, and participate in Georgia's industrial growth, both for existing and new business within the State and in those coming from outside.

The importance to Georgia of small business is shown, Mr. Lane said, by the fact that of the 6,000 businesses in Atlanta, only 300 employ more than 100. One result of the development corporation will be that profit opportunities may be realized which have been missed in the past for lack of venture capital.

In effect, the corporation will serve not only to provide capital for plant expansion, etc., but also will serve to spread the risk of such loans, Mr. Lane explained, that the activities of the development corporation will tend to expand rather than curtail the operations of Citizens and Southern's own small-business loan department.

Started in Atlanta in 1945, separate departments have been in operation for 2½ years in all of the 10 Georgia cities served by Citizens and Southern. Since 1945, Citizens and Southern has made nearly 8,000 loans directly to small businesses, totaling \$50 million.

NEED FOR LIBERALIZING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear today from Mr. George E. Lewis, representative of the Wisconsin Council of County and Municipal Employees, urging the enactment of the proposed legislation, H. R. 13549, a measure liberalizing social-security benefits.

As we know, there are almost 12 million people in this country who will be benefited if this proposal is approved by Congress, as I believe it should be. In Wisconsin, the standards of living would be "lifted" for more than 281,000 folks.

As passed by the House of Representatives, the provisions of H. R. 13549 are, of course, extremely modest. If further liberalization can be accomplished without (a) too heavy a tax on contributors to the social security fund, or (b) jeopardizing the actuarial soundness of the program itself, then I believe this should be done.

I am pleased that, according to present plans, the Senate Finance Committee will soon conclude its consideration of this important measure. I respectfully urge expeditious action on the bill by the Senate so that there can be final enactment prior to adjournment.

It was particularly gratifying to have this expression of endorsement from Mr. Lewis, representing 2,000 members from the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO. I ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL OF COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES,

ROBERT J. OBERBECK, Executive Director.
JOHN A. LAWTON, General Counsel.

August 11, 1958.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I understand that the Senate Finance Committee has or will soon be reporting H. R. 13549 to the Senate floor for action. This bill will increase benefits under Federal old-age, survivors and disability insurance system, improve the actuarial status of a trust fund of such system and make other improvements in the social security act. The two thousand members of the American Federation of State,

County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, in the district of Wisconsin which I represent, are very much interested in the improvements which are proposed in H. R. 13549.

As you know, the problem of the senior citizen is an evergrowing one; the reasons being twofold. One being the everincreasing cost of living and the other the everincreasing number of senior citizens.

We were very disappointed to learn that the Forand bill has no chance in the 85th Congress, but were pleased to be advised that the Mills bill has passed the lower house and would urge your support of the bill in the United States Senate.

I am sure that you know, but I will again call it to your attention that there are many people in Wisconsin who are retiring after long years of public employment who will have no other means of support than social security benefits. The Wisconsin retirement plan is a very good supplement to social security, but unfortunately, many counties and municipalities have not taken advantage of the plan.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE E. LEWIS,
Representative.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that the House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 2266) entitled "An act to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N. H., Naval Shipyard," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 628) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237), the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Indiana desire?

Mr. JENNER. I should like to have 40 minutes.

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan has just let the cat out of the bag. He admits that the bill is a Federal-aid-to-education program.

It matters not how it is tried to dress the old gal; it may be called a defense program; but it is still a Federal-aid-to-education program.

The people of Indiana do not want it; my State does not want it. I shall try

to find some way, if the bill becomes law, to prohibit \$1 of the money from going to the State of Indiana. There is no other State which cannot do what the State of Indiana can do, if the State wants to do it.

We sit here and act as though the Federal Government has the money. Where do we suppose the Federal Government gets the money? It gets it from the people who live in the 48 States.

I think one of the best analyses of the whole matter which I have read is that made by Representative RALPH W. GWINN, of New York. This is what he said:

I have had the honor to serve in the Congress for 14 years. During much of that time, I have watched with growing apprehension an increasing tendency by many of our people to unload on the Federal doorstep what should be the responsibilities of the family, the local, or the State government.

One of those responsibilities is education.

For the past several years, the halls of Congress have swarmed with advocates of Federal appropriations for school construction, teachers' salaries, vocational education, guidance, scholarships, and fellowships, and student loans.

Mr. President, I depart for a moment from Representative GWINN's remarks. Under the provisions of the bill before the Senate today, it is not necessary for a person to study the subjects he says he will study when he gets the money. He does not have to give any service whatever in return for the money. A person can take the money of the Federal Government as a pure gift and study tap dancing or the arrangement of flowers, or anything else he wishes to do. The money has nothing to do with the national defense. That is only the guise and the emergency which will enable the people who have been working on such a measure all these years to put the nose of the camel under the tent in the last days of this session, and to force something on the people which the people do not want and do not need.

I return to the statement by Representative GWINN:

Each idea for Federal direction of education is couched in terms of an emergency. Each one is inevitably adorned in the trappings of a special situation. The pattern is consistent. We are almost literally asked to believe that the United States will decay in the likeness of ancient Rome unless a Washington bureaucracy assumes command of education.

Up to date, the Congress has resisted these flamboyant appeals in the critical field of education. It has managed to keep its head above water in a veritable flood of unthinking, unreasoning emotions.

But now, during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, there is talk and proposed legislation—H. R. 13247, National Defense Education Act of 1958—for a new Federal venture in education. Obviously, a new scarecrow, another tune on that old saw, national defense.

Mr. President, that statement was made by Representative GWINN on July 30. Here we are on August 13. Everything of which Representative GWINN was fearful has happened. The bill is before the Senate today. We will have to vote on it before 11 o'clock tonight. I continue:

We are deafened by variations of stale and musty arguments in behalf of this outrageous scheme.

Last year, we were asked to intrude the Federal Government into education—

This was the crisis last year—that there was a crisis in school construction. That was a dud.

It did not go over. It is sought to revive it here today.

There never was such a boom in school-room construction. This year, we are besieged by a clamor for Federal direction of education on the grounds it is vital to national defense.

Mr. President, I suppose that the teaching of the arrangement of flowers and the teaching of tap dancing might help the national defense; I do not know. But that is what one can do under the bill.

Representative GWINN continues:

What about next year? What will be the emergency in the 86th Congress? We may be sure that the 25-year-old lobby for Federal aid will drum one up.

I shall not be with you,

Representative GWINN says—

My stay in this Chamber nears its end.

Let me interpose to say that I am in the same position.

I shall watch the next Congress from the viewpoint of an average citizen and taxpayer. But I can foresee, at this moment, that the struggle to keep education free is far from ended, and now is the time to prepare for the assault against freedom that is bound to come in 1959.

Mr. President, the assault came sooner than even Representative GWINN realized. It came in August of this year.

The possibility of Federal control of education cannot escape us when we see how many Federal programs incubate and seldom die.

It is not enough to insert a line or paragraph in any bill which states that the Federal Government shall not control education, regardless of the Federal funds allotted to the purpose. No such inclusion is a guaranty. We must bear in mind the blunt fact that wherever there is Federal appropriation, there must be Federal control.

Do we want a central education agency? May God forbid. It is the future and not alone the present we must think about. What assurance can we have against the possibility of some future administration that would seek to conform our youth to its particular way of thinking? There is an old saying that powers lodged in some hands will be respected, but if the same powers are inherited by other hands, they can be destructive.

I have brought together for your files and for your possible guidance in the years ahead a number of quotations on the subject of Federal intervention in education. Some of the statements were made several years ago—and the authors today are in sharp variance with their expressed viewpoints of the past. Other statements are as new as last week.

These quotations may be ammunition for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are determined that education shall not suffer from bondage to the Federal Government. The classroom must remain a lasting evidence of our devotion to the principle of liberty.

Mr. President, Representative GWINN then included various quotations. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUOTES OF THE PAST AND PRESENT ON FEDERAL AID

Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1949: "I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all States in the Union for educational purposes. Such a policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely destroy and defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local supervision over local expenditures of local revenues." (Quoted by Ross Roy in Vital Speeches.)

President Eisenhower, 1956: "Geographical balance of power is essential to our form of free society. If you take the centralizing shortcut every time something is to be done, you will perhaps sometimes get quick action. But there is no perhaps about the price you will pay for your impatience; the growth of a swollen bureaucratic monster government in Washington, in whose shadow our State and local governments will ultimately wither and die."

President's [Eisenhower] Committee on Education Beyond the High School, second report, 1958: "The committee recommends that private, local, and State sources increase their support of scholarship funds to several times the present amount and number of scholarships. The Committee believes that, insofar as assistance by the Federal Government is concerned, it should not at the present time, in the light of the considerations presented earlier in this chapter, undertake to provide new scholarships (other than work-study) for undergraduate students."

John Foster Dulles, December 28, 1949: "The Federal Government is no independent source of funds. It has to get what it gives. Whatever money it spends for education must be taken away from local communities—from individuals. Why not leave the responsibility with them, where the money is and where the responsibility is normally the deepest and most conscientious?"

"We can be confident that educational responsibilities will generally be discharged at the local level if Federal taxes permit and if we get over the illusion that Federal aid is a financially painless operation. Then our children will get education that is guided by parental and religious care rather than by remote control. And they will be kept beyond the grasp of any who, in the future, might win national power and feel that education ought to conform our youth to their particular way of thinking."

Marion B. Folsom, Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare, December 1957: "The training of young minds is one of the most powerful forces known to civilization. In the wrong hands—in the hands of ruthless men bent on world domination—education can become a dangerous thing."

Treasury Secretary Humphrey, June 1957: "More elementary and secondary school bonds were sold than in any 9-month period in our history. * * * In the past 4 years \$8.8 billion has been spent for school construction—more than had been spent in the preceding 20 years."

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, majority leader, United States Senate, 1958: "The primary direction of education should be in the hands of local government."

"On anything as highly personal as education, our people are entitled to determine the future of their children."

"This means that the school system should be handled by that branch of government which is closest to our people."

The Supreme Court of the United States, 1942, *Wickard v. Filburn* (317 U. S. 111-113).

"It is hardly lack of due process (of law) for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

Senator HARRY C. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, United States Senate, 1957: "We must realize that creeping paternalism of the Federal Government is just as bad as creeping socialism. The end result is the same—the destruction of the principles of free government."

John M. Stalnaker, president, March 20, 1958, National Merit Scholarship Corp.: "A large Federal program of say 40,000 scholarships would probably have as its major effect discouraging existing private and State efforts and would not significantly help able students not already being helped."

Commission on Financing Higher Education Association of American Universities, 1952: "The strength of higher education is founded upon its freedom and upon the country's freedom, for without that freedom, its attraction to intelligence, its capacity to stimulate investigation and originality, its power to produce free men who will guide our country wisely, and serve it well, will wither. It is this freedom that must be protected if it becomes dependent upon any dominant support, no matter how beneficent or how enlightened that support may presently appear to be. Such independence will be threatened if higher education is subjected to further influence from the Federal Government. * * * In these fields (social sciences and humanities) public opinion is notoriously given to snap judgment and in them centralized control could be used to do great damage. * * * Direct Federal control would in the end produce uniformity, mediocrity, and compliance."

Enoch R. Needles, president, the Engineers Joint Council, January 1958: "To ascribe the Russian rocket and satellite lead to weakness in American technology is misleading and erroneous."

Dr. V. Raymond Edman, president, Wheaton College, 1958: "We believe that Federal scholarships, good as they may seem on the outside, can be a real handicap to the highest interests of the American people."

Henry M. Wriston, president, American Assembly and a State Department consultant, March 1958:

"The bill will smother science and education by making private support unnecessary. 'Whatever you do, my brethren, don't get a built-in dependence of science on war. When fear ends, support will evaporate.'"

The American Legion, policy approved in national convention, September 16-19, 1957: "The National Government should avoid interference, control or direction in educational processes of programs of the respective States, either directly or indirectly or by grants-in-aid, school construction, appropriation, curriculum or program control, or by action of any agency, branch or department of the United States Government."

Governor Daniel, of Texas, 1957: "I think this is a responsibility the States and local governments can and should bear."

Governor Daniel, of Texas, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "We should preserve as much of our Government as possible as close as possible to the people * * * no nation worth its salt, was ever built from the top down * * * we need more effective work done at the State level, with enough nerve to levy the taxes to get needed work done."

Governor Clyde, of Utah, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "Only in those cases where State lines interfere with effective accomplishment should we look to the Great White Father in Washington for assistance."

Governor Simpson, of Wyoming, 1957: "Once you establish this principle, you will have sounded the death knell of independent State and local systems."

Governor Simpson, of Wyoming, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "Here's my definition of Federal aid: It means we raise our taxes to send some money to Washington, then we raise more money in order to provide the matching funds. Then we raise more again to pay the brokerage tax, in order to get a fraction of the money back."

Governor Foss, of South Dakota, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "No government at any level has anything to offer free."

Gov. William P. Stratton, of Illinois, 1957: "Many people feel—as I do—that there is great danger, no matter how high sounding the program may be made to appeal to the public, that our system would be damaged, perhaps beyond recovery, by having the Federal Government move into the field of education."

"We do not need Federal aid for schools in Illinois."

Governor Stratton, of Illinois, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "The unity that is our Federal system relies on the strength of our States * * * in some areas of functions and services, the States can perform more effectively and better and must accept that responsibility."

Governor O'Neill, of Ohio, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "There is no magic source from which the Federal Government gets the money. It must come from the taxpayers * * * now is the time to take action to resolve the unemployment problems in our own State. * * * I am opposed to borrowing from the Federal Government because it will lead to Federal interference, furthermore, our States can do the job more economically and much better * * * in the highway program we can cut Federal red tape to permit the program to move faster."

Lt. Gov. Carroll Gartin, of Mississippi, 1957: "All districts can meet needs with State aid * * * Federal aid not needed."

Governor Chandler, of Kentucky, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "There are many sins being committed in the name of education. * * * I recommend a complete overhaul of the tax structure of the Federal Government, with a view of returning some of the sources to the States."

George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Governor of South Carolina, 1957: "No one on the national level is endowed with sufficient knowledge to predetermine accurately the future needs of the whole country. The problem of public school construction is too intricate to be handled by long distance. Too many variable factors are involved in intelligent planning. These factors multiply as we move from the district level to the community level and then to the local school level. It is farcical to think that a program can be developed in Washington to meet the needs of the Nation."

Gov. Harold Handley, of Indiana, 1957: "We are providing these new classrooms twice as fast as the advocates of federalized education say we should be building them."

Governor Handley, of Indiana, July 22, 1958:

"Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions, and institutions now independent or State-supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence."

"Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually."

Governor Handley wrote me last week that a statewide survey showed that all the high standing students needing financial help had been provided for.

Gov. James E. Folsom, of Alabama, 1957: "Federal school aid would mean they'd try to control our schools."

Gov. Thomas B. Stanley, of Virginia, 1957: "I am vigorously opposed to any Federal aid program in this field under whatever guise it may be offered. The States and localities are capable of meeting their needs at much greater economy to the taxpayer without Federal aid or intervention in building and operating their public schools."

Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the House of Representatives concurring, 1957: "The Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to reject any and all efforts to obtain the passage of legislation by the terms of which money would be appropriated and made available to the States, through grants-in-aid or otherwise for school building or other purposes, which either indirectly or directly would infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local and State governments or authorities to provide, supervise, and control the education of the children of this country or the accompanying educational processes."

South Carolina Legislature, 1957: "The people of South Carolina are now, always have been and shall always be unequivocally, incontrovertibly, and unalterably opposed to any Federal invasion, encroachment, or infringement of the fundamental right, obligation, and duty of the people and their local governmental authority to provide, supervise, and control the education of the children of this State or the educational processes concomitant thereon which would directly or indirectly infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local or State governments."

John C. Lynn, legislative director, the American Farm Bureau Federation, March 113, 1958: "Counties and communities throughout the Nation are spending unprecedented sums for new schoolroom construction, and efforts are being made to increase teachers' salaries and to improve the overall conditions of our schools. Local people understand this challenge and will meet it through local taxation without Federal assistance and without Federal controls."

Mrs. William S. Shary, president, New York Federation of Women's Clubs, April 5, 1958: "The New York State Federation of Women's Clubs * * * affirms its belief in our traditional American principles and policies of State and local support and control of, and responsibility for, education, and urges the Congress to reject provisions for Federal aid to education."

Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, president general, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1956: "Federal aid means Federal control. You cannot get away from the fact that he who pays the piper calls the tune."

Daughters of the American Revolution, 1957: "The National Society, Daughter of the American Revolution has continuously opposed Federal aid to education, believing such aid could lead to Government control of all public schools, thereby removing State and local control."

Dr. Cyrus W. Anderson, president, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., April 2, 1958: "Make no mistake about it, 'one shot' Federal aid is as fantastically unrealistic as only one shot for the dope addict. And there is a mountain of evidence to prove it."

Gordon L. Calvert, July 1958, Investment Bankers Association of America: "The great success with which the needed classrooms rapidly are being provided without Federal aid, the decreasing rate of growth in public school enrollment, the large classroom construction programs presently underway and financed for the next several years (demonstrated by record sales of school bonds and approval of a high percentage of school

bonds at recent bond elections) lead us to conclude that State and local educational agencies can and will provide the needed classrooms without Federal aid."

Southern States Industrial Council: "The council opposes Federal aid to education, including Federal aid to school construction."

National Association of Manufacturers: "The heart of the matter is whether the financing, direction, and control of the public school system shall remain in State and local hands, close to the people and responsive to their wishes and needs, or shall eventually be transferred to a central government authority."

Dr. Brantley Watson, March 1958 Education Committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

"When our entrance into the space age was dramatized last fall, State and local reaction was immediate and is still mounting. State and local boards of education are reviewing the curriculums, the methods, and the standards of their schools. In community after community, we are finding an aroused leadership insisting on higher standards both for general achievement and for graduation. Local and State legislative leaders, who are constitutionally responsible for public education, are likewise being pressed to provide ways and means to maintain effective schools."

"On the other hand, there are no studies showing that local and State leaders believe that any space age emergency in education exists, which requires Federal intervention in science education, or in guidance, or in scholarships."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, let me quote a few of the statements. The President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, in 1949, said:

I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all States in the Union for educational purposes. Such a policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely destroy and defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local supervision over local expenditures of local revenues. (Quoted by Ross Roy in *Vital Speeches*.)

Let us make up our minds whether we want to follow our President or leave him. It is not ancient history. Let me quote President Eisenhower again, in 1956:

Geographical balance of power is essential to our form of free society. If you take the centralizing shortcut every time something is to be done, you will perhaps sometimes get quick action. But there is no perhaps about the price you will pay for your impatience; the growth of a swollen bureaucratic monster government in Washington, in whose shadow our State and local governments will ultimately wither and die.

I have read the President's statement of his beliefs.

I read now from the second report in 1958 of President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School:

The Committee recommends that private, local, and State sources increase their support of scholarship funds to several times the present amount and number of scholarships. The Committee believes that, insofar as assistance by the Federal Government is concerned, it should not at the present time, in the light of the considerations presented earlier in this chapter, undertake to provide new scholarships (other than work-study) for undergraduate students."

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, stated, on December 28, 1949:

The Federal Government is no independent source of funds. It has to get what it gives. Whatever money it spends for education must be taken away from local communities—from individuals. Why not leave the responsibility with them, where the money is and where the responsibility is normally the deepest and most conscientious?

We can be confident that educational responsibilities will generally be discharged at the local level if Federal taxes permit and if we get over the illusion that Federal aid is a financially painless operation. Then our children will get education that is guided by parental and religious care rather than by remote control. And they will be kept beyond the grasp of any who, in the future, might win national power and feel that education ought to conform our youth to their particular way of thinking.

Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated in December 1957:

The training of young minds is one of the most powerful forces known to civilization. In the wrong hands—in the hands of ruthless men bent on world domination—education can become a dangerous thing.

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey stated in June 1957:

More elementary and secondary school bonds were sold than in any 9-month period in our history. * * * In the past 4 years \$8.8 billion has been spent for school construction—more than had been spent in the preceding 20 years.

The distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] stated in 1958:

The primary direction of education should be in the hands of local government.

On anything as highly personal as education, our people are entitled to determine the future of their children.

This means that the school system should be handled by that branch of government which is closest to our people.

Mr. President, listen to the following statements:

The Supreme Court of the United States, 1942, *Wickard v. Filburn* (317 U.S. 111-113):

It is hardly lack of due process (of law) for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] stated in 1957:

We must realize that creeping paternalism of the Federal Government is just as bad as creeping socialism. The end result is the same—the destruction of the principles of free government.

John M. Stalnaker, president, National Merit Scholarship Corp., March 20, 1958:

A large Federal program of say 40,000 scholarships would probably have as its major effect discouraging existing private and State efforts and would not significantly help able students not already being helped.

Commission on Financing Higher Education, Association of American Universities, 1952:

The strength of higher education is founded upon its freedom and upon the country's freedom, for without that freedom, its attraction to intelligence, its capacity to stimulate investigation and originality, its power to produce freemen who will guide our country wisely, and serve it well will wither. It is this freedom that must be

protected if it becomes dependent upon any dominant support, no matter how beneficent or how enlightened that support may presently appear to be. Such independence will be threatened if higher education is subjected to further influence from the Federal Government * * *. In these fields (social sciences and humanities) public opinion is notoriously given to snap judgment and in them centralized control could be used to do great damage * * *. Direct Federal control would in the end produce uniformity, mediocrity, and compliance.

Enoch R. Needles, president, the Engineers Joint Council, January 1958:

To ascribe the Russian rocket and satellite lead to weakness in American technology is misleading and erroneous.

Dr. V. Raymond Edman, president, Wheaton College, 1958:

We believe that Federal scholarships, good as they may seem on the outside, can be a real handicap to the highest interests of the American people.

Henry M. Wriston, president, American Assembly and a State Department consultant, March 1958:

The bill will smother science and education by making private support unnecessary.

Whatever you do, my brethren, don't get a built-in dependence of science on war. When fear ends, support will evaporate.

The American Legion, policy approved in national convention, September 16-19, 1957:

The National Government should avoid interference, control or direction in educational processes of programs of the respective States, either directly or indirectly or by grants-in-aid, school construction, appropriation, curriculum or program control, or by action of any agency, branch or department of the United States Government.

Governor Daniel, of Texas, 1957:

I think this a responsibility the States and local governments can and should bear.

Governor Daniel, of Texas, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

We should preserve as much of our Government as possible as close as possible to the people * * * no nation worth its salt, was ever built from the top down * * * we need more effective work done at the State level, with enough nerve to levy the taxes to get needed work done.

Governor Clyde, of Utah, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

Only in those cases where State lines interfere with effective accomplishment should we look to the Great White Father in Washington for assistance.

Governor Simpson, of Wyoming, 1957:

Once you establish this principle, you will have sounded the death knell of independent State and local systems.

Governor Simpson, of Wyoming, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

Here's my definition of Federal aid: It means we raise our taxes to send some money to Washington, then we raise more money in order to provide the matching funds. Then we raise more again to pay the brokerage tax, in order to get a fraction of the money back.

Governor Foss, of South Dakota, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

No government at any level has anything to offer free.

Gov. William P. Stratton, of Illinois, 1957:

Many people feel—as I do—that there is great danger, no matter how high sounding the program may be made to appeal to the public, that our system would be damaged, perhaps beyond recovery, by having the Federal Government move into the field of education.

We do not need Federal aid for schools in Illinois.

Governor Stratton, of Illinois, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

The unity that is our Federal system relies on the strength of our States * * * in some areas of functions and services, the States can perform more effectively and better and must accept that responsibility.

Governor O'Neill, of Ohio, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

There is no magic source from which the Federal Government gets the money. It must come from the taxpayers. * * * Now is the time to take action to resolve the unemployment problems in our own State. * * * I am opposed to borrowing from the Federal Government because it will lead to Federal interference, furthermore, our States can do the job more economically and much better. * * * In the highway program we can cut Federal redtape to permit the program to move faster.

Lt. Gov. Carroll Gartin, of Mississippi, 1957:

All districts can meet needs with State aide. * * * Federal aid not needed.

Governor Chandler, of Kentucky, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

There are many sins being committed in the name of education. * * * I recommend a complete overhaul of the tax structure of the Federal Government, with a view of returning some of the sources to the States.

George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Governor of South Carolina, 1957:

No one on the national level is endowed with sufficient knowledge to predetermine accurately the future needs of the whole country. The problem of public school construction is too intricate to be handled by long distance. Too many variable factors are involved in intelligent planning. These factors multiply as we move from the district level to the community level and then to the local school level. It is farcical to think that a program can be developed in Washington to meet the needs of the Nation.

Gov. Harold Handley, of Indiana, 1957:

We are providing these new classrooms twice as fast as the advocates of federalized education say we should be building them.

Governor Handley, of Indiana, July 22, 1958:

Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions, and institutions now independent or State-supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually.

Governor Handley wrote last week that a statewide survey showed that all the high-standing students needing financial help had been provided for.

Gov. James E. Folsom, of Alabama, 1957:

Federal school aid would mean they'd try to control our schools.

Gov. Thomas B. Stanley, of Virginia, 1957:

I am vigorously opposed to any Federal aid program in this field under whatever guise it may be offered. The States and localities are capable of meeting their needs at much greater economy to the taxpayer without Federal aid or intervention in building and operating their public schools.

I read now a resolution of the Indiana Senate:

Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the House of Representatives concurring, 1957, The Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to reject any and all efforts to obtain the passage of legislation by the terms of which money would be appropriated and made available to the States through grants-in-aid or otherwise for school building or other purposes, which either indirectly or directly would infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local and State governments or authorities to provide, supervise, and control the education of the children of this country or the accompanying educational processes.

South Carolina Legislature, 1957:

The people of South Carolina are now, always have been, and shall always be unequivocally, incontrovertibly, and unalterably opposed to any Federal invasion, encroachment, or infringement of the fundamental right, obligation, and duty of the people and their local governmental authority to provide, supervise, and control the education of the children of this State or the educational processes concomitant thereon which would directly or indirectly infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local or State governments.

John C. Lynn, legislative director, the American Farm Bureau Federation, March 13, 1958:

Counties and communities throughout the Nation are spending unprecedented sums for new schoolroom construction, and efforts are being made to increase teachers' salaries and to improve the overall conditions of our schools. Local people understand this challenge and will meet it through local taxation without Federal assistance and without Federal controls.

Mrs. William S. Shary, president, New York Federation of Women's Clubs, April 5, 1958:

The New York State Federation of Women's Clubs * * * affirms its belief in our traditional American principles and policies of State and local support and control of, and responsibility for, education, and urges the Congress to reject provisions for Federal aid to education.

Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, president general, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1956:

Federal aid means Federal control. You cannot get away from that fact that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

Daughters of the American Revolution, 1957:

The National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, has continuously opposed Federal aid to education, believing such aid could lead to Government control of all public schools, thereby removing State and local control.

Dr. Cyrus W. Anderson, president, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., April 2, 1958:

Make no mistake about it, "one shot" Federal aid is as fantastically unrealistic as only one shot for the dope addict. And there is a mountain of evidence to prove it.

Gordon L. Calvert, July 1958, Investment Bankers Association of America:

The great success with which the needed classrooms rapidly are being provided without Federal aid, the decreasing rate of growth in public-school enrollment, the large classroom construction programs presently underway and financed for the next several years (demonstrated by record sales of school bonds and approval of a high percentage of school bonds at recent bond elections) lead us to conclude that State and local educational agencies can and will provide the needed classrooms without Federal aid.

Southern States Industrial Council:

The council opposes Federal aid to education, including Federal aid to school construction.

National Association of Manufacturers:

The heart of the matter is whether the financing, direction, and control of the public-school system shall remain in State and local hands, close to the people and responsive to their wishes and needs, or shall eventually be transferred to a central government authority.

Dr. Brantley Watson, March 1958 education committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

When our entrance into the space age was dramatized last fall, State and local reaction was immediate and is still mounting. State and local boards of education are reviewing the curriculums, the methods, and the standards of their schools. In community after community, we are finding an aroused leadership insisting on higher standards both for general achievement and for graduation. Local and State legislative leaders, who are constitutionally responsible for public education, are likewise being pressed to provide ways and means to maintain effective schools.

On the other hand, there are no studies showing that local and State leaders believe that any space age emergency in education exists, which requires Federal intervention in science education, or in guidance, or in scholarships.

Mr. President, so far as Indiana is concerned, let me say that a few days ago I had printed in the RECORD, a letter which I received from the chief executive of Indiana, Gov. Harold Handley. At this time I shall read the letter to the Senate:

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis, July 21, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: A hypothesis is only a hypothesis until it is proven or disproven by facts. Following the launching of Sputnik I, we in Indiana began a thorough factfinding study of our education system, particularly regarding science and mathematics courses, enrollments, and pupil aptitudes. The entire project was conducted by a representative committee of citizens and educators, headed by Dr. Clarence E. Manion, former dean of the University of Notre Dame Law School.

Every Indiana ninth grade student received an identical test, the results being evaluated by a professional laboratory. We also gave an extensive test to high-school senior to determine exceptional individuals.

Then we inquired of these exceptional seniors as to how many wished to enter college and how many would need financial and scholarship assistance.

The results of these tests and inquiries are detailed in the attached summary.

I shall also place it in the RECORD.

I read further from the Governor's letter:

Because there is now before the United States Congress proposed legislation for Federal scholarships, we feel that you might be particularly interested. We are convinced that Indiana does not need such Federal assistance, and that if similar factual inquiry were made in the other States the same conclusions would be tenable regarding them.

Once started, a system of federalized scholarship would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions and institutions now independent or State supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

Those are almost the words which were used by President Eisenhower.

The Governor's letter continues, as follows:

Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually.

Sincerely,

HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
Governor of Indiana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the study referred to printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION IN INDIANA SCHOOLS

(By Wilbur Young, State superintendent of public instruction)

Russian advances in the field of satellites have been responsible for criticisms of our science and mathematics education by critics of our educational system. Because of the interest expressed by the school people and the citizens in the veracity of these criticisms, the State superintendent of public instruction appointed a 14-member committee with Clarence Manion, former dean of the Notre Dame Law School and a member of the Commission on General Education of the Indiana State Board of Education, to investigate and appraise science and mathematics education in the schools of Indiana. This in part was necessitated because the schools were being blamed for the failure of the United States to launch a satellite before Russia's Sputnik I, and in part because the school people and the citizens wanted to know the truth about Indiana's educational adequacy. The committee has scientifically studied the schools in Indiana to determine the actual facts in five areas of our educational program pertinent to the teaching and achievements in the mathematics and science courses. These areas are as follows: (1) Teacher qualifications; (2) high school offerings; (3) pupil participation; (4) achievement of pupils; and (5) the need for scholarships for talented pupils. To obtain pertinent data the committee used the records of the teacher training and licensing division, the statistical division, and the research division of the State department of public instruction. In addition to this, questionnaires were mailed to all of the 707 Indiana high schools. The fact that 100 percent of the

questionnaires were returned is indicative of the excellent cooperation and true interest shown by the school administrators in aiding with this quest for the truth. Investigation of the five areas listed above has been completed and a summary of the results is as follows:

TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS

The courses taken in colleges and/or universities by all the teachers of mathematics and science were studied by examining their credentials filed in the teacher training and licensing division of the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction. These records show that all mathematics teachers in Indiana have a minimum of 24 semester hours of college credit in mathematics. Data from these files also reveal that approximately 80 percent of the biology, chemistry, and physics teachers have a teaching certificate in their specific area which, in fact, means that the biology teachers have a minimum of 24 semester hours of academic biology, and the chemistry and physics teachers have a minimum of 18 semester hours of academic chemistry and academic physics. All of the other teachers, with the exception of a very small percent, have had at least 15 hours of science. For only 2.2 percent of the biology teachers, 1 percent of the chemistry teachers, and 2.2 percent of the physics teachers were our records incomplete.

HIGH-SCHOOL OFFERINGS

The idea has been prevalent that our high schools no longer offer the challenging and solid courses in mathematics and science. The facts are that during the 1957-58 school year 85 percent of our high schools were offerings physics; 83 percent were offering chemistry; 88 percent were offering second-year algebra; 72 percent were offering trigonometry, and 62 percent were offering solid geometry. All of these schools did not offer these subjects each year but offered the courses in alternate years.

PUPIL ENROLLMENT

During the school year 1957-58 the records showed that 100 percent of the graduating seniors had at least 1 year of mathematics; 34 percent had 2 years of mathematics; 15 percent had 3 years of mathematics, and 11 percent had 4 years of mathematics. Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard and former United States High Commissioner to Germany, recently used in a nationwide telecast our data that 11 percent of Indiana graduates have 4 years of secondary mathematics, as an indication of the strength of the American comprehensive secondary school. Of this year's (1957-58) graduates, 100 percent had 1 year of science; 26 percent had 2 years of science; 15 percent had 3 years of science; 2 percent had 4 years of science. These figures indicate that about as many high-school pupils in Indiana today are enrolled in advance science and mathematics courses as could profit from the accelerated study of these subjects. This statement assumes that it is the most capable and talented students who are enrolled in these advanced courses.

ACHIEVEMENT OF PUPILS

The science and mathematics committee tested the ninth-grade pupils in mathematics and science. The California Test Bureau of Los Angeles, Calif., was selected to provide the tests in mathematics and science. Schools were invited to participate on a voluntary basis. Of the approximately 63,000 pupils enrolled in the ninth grade, over 44,000 students took both the science and the mathematics tests.

The results of these tests have very definitely established the high caliber of our students both in past and present achievement and in the prognostication of their future scholastic ability and achievement.

The tests were validated on the national norms previously established and grade placements were also derived and ascertained from these national norms.

In the area of mathematics, the median grade level for Indiana's 9th-grade students was at the 10th grade. Approximately 27 percent of the total number of 9th grade students taking the test showed a grade equivalent of 13 (college level) or more, while approximately 58 percent showed grade equivalents at or above the 10th year grade level.

In the area of physical science, the median grade level for these 9th grade students was at the 9th grade level; however, 36 percent of the students taking the physical science exam showed a 10th grade equivalent or more.

In the area of biological science, the median grade level was the ninth grade, the same as in the area of physical science. Thirty-four percent of the 9th grade students taking this test placed at the 10th grade equivalent or more.

Results show that 61.6 percent were above the national norms in mathematical reasoning and mathematical fundamentals, and 50.7 percent were above the national norms in physical and biological sciences. More students were above the national norms in physical science than in biological science because many city schools offer biology to 10th grade students while the test was given to 9th grade students.

THE NEED FOR SCHOLARSHIPS FOR TALENTED PUPILS

A questionnaire was sent to the 707 high school principals in Indiana asking the following question:

"How many students in your school qualify by the way of interest, ability, and aptitude in science and mathematics to perform successful college work; how many do you estimate are unable to attend college because of lack of financial resources?"

The replies to this question indicated that there were approximately 2,000 students who had the interest, ability, and aptitude for science and mathematics but lacked the funds needed for higher education.

A 4½-hour comprehensive examination in science, mathematics, English, and social studies was given to all seniors wanting to take the examination. Of the estimated 2,000 qualified pupils who needed aid as reported on the questionnaires, 703 of these pupils took this comprehensive examination and the results were sent to Yonkers, N. Y., where they were machine scored.

There were 199 of the 703 pupils who ranked above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science based on national norms. The 199 pupils were then divided into 4 categories:

1. Twenty-seven pupils were counted in group I that included all pupils making above the 90th percentile based on national norms in each of the four fields of mathematics, science, English, and social studies.

2. Seventy-three pupils were counted in group II that included all pupils making above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science, and a percentile average of above 90 in the 4 areas tested.

3. Ninety-nine pupils were counted in group III that included all pupils ranking above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science but making a percentile rating of 90 or lower in English and social studies.

The committee decided to consider at this time any of those pupils in the group III for scholarship aid who had a percentile ranking of 95 or above in mathematics and science. This consideration included 179 of the 199 students. These students were asked concerning their ability to finance their higher education. Twenty-three students did not reply and it was assumed they had financial resources for attending college.

Fourteen students stated that they had sufficient funds to attend a college or university of their own choice for 1 year. Twenty-five students advised the committee that they were going into fields other than mathematics and science in higher education therefore automatically eliminating themselves.

A need formula was applied to the 117 remaining and qualified pupils. This formula has been widely used throughout the United States to determine, first, the financial need necessary and, second, the amount of financial aid required in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

Sixty-four students were eliminated by the formula, leaving 53 qualifying for aid for amounts from \$10 to \$1,200. Of the 53 qualifying for financial aid, 37 already had scholarships ranging from \$25 to \$750.

The committee learned that the problem at hand was not to provide scholarships as only 16 were needed and can be taken care of but the problem concerns provision for financial assistance for those already having scholarships in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

A plan is being devised whereby the 53 needing financial aid in order to complete 1 year of college education may secure that aid providing, of course, they enroll in college this fall and make satisfactory grades.

The results of the study of these five areas have shown conclusively that the training and education directed to our students do not in any way preclude their ability to achieve and to meet the challenges of our changing world.

The facts do show that our schools are very adequately meeting the needs, interests, and abilities of the pupils. Therefore, there is no basis whatsoever for unfavorable criticisms concerning Indiana's educational system. The aims, the objectives, and the philosophy of our schools sharpen and challenge the working tools of the pupils. Since progress is an important product, our youth will not mark time but will keep pace with all the developmental tasks that our culture expects of them.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE FIVE AREAS

Teacher qualifications: The records of Indiana's mathematics and science teachers show that they are well qualified to teach in these subject areas.

High school offerings: Indiana's high schools are definitely offering adequate mathematics and science courses to meet the needs of our challenging students.

Pupil enrollment: The records show that Indiana's high school seniors for 1957-58 had a firm and substantial background in both mathematics and science.

Achievement of pupils: Results of a mathematics and science test showed that in the area of mathematics, the median grade level for Indiana's 9th grade students was at the 10th grade. A large percentage of these students ranked at the grade equivalent of 13 (college level) or more.

In the science area, the median grade level was the 9th grade, while a large percentage ranked at the 10th grade equivalent or more.

The need for scholarships for talented pupils: A 4½-hour comprehensive examination (essential high school content battery, form BM.) was taken by 703 qualified high school seniors.

One hundred and ninety-nine or 28.3 percent of these 703 seniors made a percentile ranking, based on national norms, above 90; however, the committee decided not to consider for scholarship, at this time, those students who had an average percentile ranking of 94 or below in the areas of mathematics and science, and an average percentile ranking of 90 or below in the areas of English and social studies. This eliminated 20 of the 199 students.

By process of further elimination according to pupil interest, course of study pursued, and a financial need formula; only 53 students, who were still qualified, remained.

A plan is being devised whereby those 53 students needing financial assistance may obtain this aid from private sources in Indiana. The committee is convinced that Federal assistance on this program is neither necessary nor desirable.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, many arguments can be made in opposition to the pending bill, which now is called the defense education bill. However, at this time I shall refer to only two arguments against the so-called defense education bill, as it is called today. It used to be referred to as the bill for Federal aid to education; but now we are told that it is a bill for the purpose of defense—in other words, that it is a defense activity when a student studies how to arrange flowers or how to dance. So now the bill is called a defense bill.

Either of the two arguments I shall now submit is a sufficient reason for the defeat of the bill:

First. We do not want the Federal Government's heavy hand on the education of our young people. Federal financing must, under the law, be accompanied by Federal supervision.

Second. The Federal Government has no money. Every dollar appropriated by such a bill would be paid in red ink, thus sending our deficit ever higher for years to come, if not forever. State and local governments and private agencies are ready and willing to meet their responsibilities, but they will not be able to raise the money if the Federal Government takes it first.

NO CASE FOR FEDERAL FUNDS

No case has been made for Federal financial aid for any part of the educational job, except for short-run Federal contributions for local areas hit by military installations, and so forth. The necessity for Federal contributions to local areas which have been affected by military installations and such is the only real justification for such Federal aid. But that aid has already been given by the Congress, and it should continue to be given.

However, the system now proposed would be a blanket system.

The statistics submitted in support of Federal contributions are among the most discredited arguments ever submitted to Congress. Representative RALPH GWINN and others have completely punctured their validity.

The defense education proposals are no whit better than all the preceding ones. They were thrown together hastily, in an attempt to achieve under the influence of the sputniks, the same tired, old programs for federalization that Congress had withstood again and again.

THE GIFTED NEEDY

The argument that many gifted students cannot complete their education because they lack the means is one of the most dishonest of all the arguments used in connection with this subject. I repeat, Mr. President, the argument that many gifted students cannot complete their education because they lack the means to do so is one of the most dishonest of all the arguments.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Indiana, Wilbur Young, sent me a letter in which he analyzed a complete study which was made in the State of Indiana. I ask my colleagues to consider what that study shows. I stress the point that the situation which has been found to exist in Indiana will likewise be found to exist in other States.

Mr. President, the Senate is asked to act on a bill about which it does not have the bona fide facts. Instead, the Senate is requested to act on the basis of propaganda and dishonest arguments.

The study which was made in Indiana showed the following:

Estimated students of high ability in math or science, but lacking funds, 2,000.

Students who appeared for scholarship examinations, 703.

So, Mr. President, at that point approximately 1,300 students had dropped out; even though they were qualified, they did not wish to attend college, and therefore they did not appear to take the scholarship examinations. The question of finances was not involved.

Of the 703 who appeared to take the scholarship examinations, only 199 were above the 90th percentile; and I guess that is what we want. If we are to have a defense program, we want students who will take mathematics and science, and we want high-quality students.

Now, notice the figures. Those in financial need of from only \$10 to \$1,200 a year numbered 53 students in the entire State of Indiana, out of a population of 4½ million. I will lay anyone odds that if the rest of the States made a comprehensive study of their situation, their figures would be comparable to those of Indiana.

Of the 53, we have scholarships not even being used, but we will forget about that. The State chamber of commerce of my State is now publicly establishing a fund of \$50,000 to lend to those students. Oh, no, not to give to them. Under the Federal program, the money will be given to students. So they are all going to take it. Good old Uncle Sam's gravy train comes along again. Only 53 lacked finances, and the money will be made available to them, but they will have to pay it back after they get their education. That is the way we do business in Indiana, and some of the other States had better start copying it, or we shall all go down the drain together.

DISTORTION OF STUDIES

We need more and harder work of higher quality in science and mathematics. Does that prove we do not need more students, more work and higher quality in the liberal arts, and so forth?

It is said that mathematics is the basis of this bill, but a student will be able to study whatever he wants to. He will be able to do what he pleases, and he will not be obligated to pay the money back.

Even for the single object of defeating the Communists we may have as much need of diplomats, writers, businessmen, and lawyers as we have of engineers and scientists.

Military weapons are not our only recourse in the struggle. We need non-

scientific experts in government and politics, to be sure even our scientific and military programs are not sabotaged, because the truth of it is that the most valuable secrets of this Nation were stolen from our laboratories and given to our enemies by the scientists and the smart boys, who were Americans.

Why should the Federal Government intervene and distort the shape of our educational efforts? The decision on how much science and mathematics—as against languages and psychology—our students need is the business of educators. Neither Congress nor the Federal executive has any business in the picture.

PLENTY OF LEADERSHIP IN STATE AND PRIVATE AGENCIES

Does anyone seriously argue that either State or private agencies are incapable of understanding the nature of the present crisis or meeting it? Are we claiming that only bureaucrats in Washington are concerned about the defense needs of our country?

I do not know any issue which has aroused such vigorous, enlightened immediate response among our people as this.

The Indiana Chamber of Commerce is evidence of the sense of responsibility and quick response of private business. They were able not only to raise the money they needed, but to mobilize some of the best educational leaders of the State for professional advice. They were fully supported by the Indiana State educational authorities.

FEDERAL FINANCING IS FEDERAL CONTROL

Not a dollar of Federal money can be spent without supervision by Federal bureaucrats of how the money is spent.

The real result—and perhaps the real objective—of the Federal scholarship programs is uniform Federal examinations with Federal steering of students where the Government wants them to go. We want no uniform Federal examinations. This is the leftwing pressure for compulsory uniformity.

We want no Federal rosters of who are and who are not good students. What chance would a scholar have for a Federal grant if all his work was against the trend to central control?

I ask, What chance would I have of getting a Federal grant when I have been fighting these things publicly? It would be said, "He does not conform. He does not fit. He cannot be molded. We do not want him."

I do not want the Federal Government ever to put its clammy hand on the free educational system of this country, because if it does, it will be delving into the home and the church and local governments, and no good can come of it.

Selection of students by ability is the very mechanism by which the Soviet Union gets so much control over young people and over the next generation of professional leaders.

Students are wise, and soon realize they had better say nothing critical of the Federal Government, and then they will not lose out later.

THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM

There are gimmicks in this program, providing funds for psychological test-

ing, which are dangerous instruments for thought control.

Section 701 authorizes the appropriation of \$15 million a year for programs of testing and guidance and counseling. It is also in section 501 and section 207. It is all through the bill.

Let us not be deceived by the small amount. The nose of the camel is always small.

Let us not be deceived by the innocent-sounding name. This business of testing and guidance and counseling smells to high heaven. It is the special thought-control branch of the educationists.

We worry about Russia. About 30 years ago Russia adopted our system of education. Thirty years ago we adopted the system of Columbia University. Now the proponents want thought control. The Federal Government is going to guide and counsel—\$15 million worth of it, just to start.

Some of my colleagues may remember that during the debate on the Japanese peace treaty I discussed the influence of UNESCO in our schools. These tests have been used to overemphasize sex, to set up conflicts between parents and children, between races and between sections, for internationalism and against our Constitution. Then the results are kept secret in files parents cannot see.

Reports by the educationists themselves show that the guidance departments are those for which the students have the least respect.

This innocent little appropriation is almost the worst thing in the bill, because it opens Pandora's box so that almost anything in the way of national control of ability, fitness, and the rest can be imposed on our States and indirectly on our private institutions.

Now, Mr. President, I turn to the other half of the story.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JENNER. As I understood the matter with the leadership, I was to have all the time I wanted. Otherwise, I would not have agreed to the unanimous consent request. I am going to insist I be permitted to finish.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. JENNER. I do not know. I had to get this material together very hurriedly. I did not know until 11:15 last night the bill was going to be up for consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator give some idea of the time he may need?

Mr. JENNER. Perhaps 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Indiana, and more time if he needs it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Federal Government has no money. It is in a pitiful financial condition. The administration is now before the Committee on Finance saying, "It is necessary to raise the debt limit a second time

this year." Despite that, we are talking about passing bills to spend more money which we do not have.

In the books that were closed on the 30th of this June, the Federal Government added another \$2.8 billion of debt. In the year we have just entered, Secretary Anderson estimates that the deficit will be \$12 billion. But we do not yet know how many mandatory spending bills will come out of this spending Congress. I think this is the worst spending Congress in the history of this country, and it is all done in peacetime. Of one thing we can be sure: The deficit will not be less than \$12 billion for fiscal 1959, or \$15 billion for the 2 years.

I think it is time we took responsibility for studying this debt from the political instead of the financial point of view.

Our problem is not the addition of \$2 billion or \$15 billion to the public debt. Our problem is the successful operation of an inner steering committee which is determined that the American Government shall not get out of the red, ever.

Its objectives are simple. Deficit financing erodes the value of the dollar, it is true. But that is not its most important effect. Deficit financing erodes the middle classes.

Now do Senators see why we have one lovely program after another for more Government spending, but never any workable plans for paying off the debt?

An honest stable dollar is the most important instrument for all productive enterprises, which pay out only after long, hard work. A dishonest dollar is the most important instrument for speculation, gambling, fly-by-night enterprises, where returns can be raked in quickly.

The question before us is not: Do we want another billion-dollar deficit. The question is: Do we want a Government fiscal policy which encourages production and enterprise or one which puts a premium on speculation?

If one is thrifty and saves his own money, and uses it to buy a house or a farm or start a business, one needs a dollar of constant value so he can calculate his risks. Only where financial order prevails can men take risks for the long term, or start the kind of projects which require years for the harvest.

When the value of the dollar is no longer predictable, prudent men give up their plans for productive enterprise. Speculators and gamblers move in and take over, or governments or some man on a white horse. Everything is designed for quick returns.

Productive enterprises wither on the vine, but fly-by-night operators grow richer and richer. The growth area of the economy is injured. With each passing year the damage grows worse. The shell of a great productive economy remains, but its substance is full of air pockets.

Let me carry my point one step further. Which is more important for strengthening American economic superiority in war—a national economy which encourages in every way the healthy growth of productive enterprise, or one which gives all the advantages to the speculator and quick-change artists?

Now we see why the question of deficit financing can never be settled if we look at it only from the view of financial statistics and forget that finance is the most powerful lever in all political action.

I ask Senators to go back to see how we got into this morass.

After 1933 the New Dealers talked of deficit financing, but we remember we were to spend in hard times, and pay back in good times. During the thirties the debt rose steadily to a total of \$50 billion in 1939.

Did we go back to \$50 billion when the war was over? No. For the calendar year 1945 the debt was \$259 billion. Obviously, if we had really turned to deficit financing as a depression remedy, we would have paid off a large part of the debt after 1945. But no; almost without interruption the debt crept up. Instead of a reduction of tens of billions in the 13 prosperous years from 1945 to today, we had an increase of \$17 billion. Even if we allow for the entire cost of the Korean war, we have not made the slightest reduction from the high of World War II.

Senators will say the Communists are responsible. And I say "nonsense." We do not need more money for preparation for war against the Communists than we spent to defeat the Nazis, Fascists, and Japanese combined.

Of course, weapons are more complex, but much of the increased cost of tanks and planes is the result of devaluation of the dollar.

I said "nonsense" because either we are serious in our talk about defending our country against the Communists, or we are not. If we are serious, we must end at once the soft, easy method of paying for defense by red-ink financing. We must decide on the Defense Establishment we need, and then cut down all other items in the budget so total spending will gradually decline.

Deficit spending is bloat. It is national suicide when we may at any moment have to carry another world war.

The Soviet Union has squeezed all the bloat out of its finances. It is building up its hoards of gold. Meanwhile we are adding to the bloat in our economic system, and letting our thin underpinning of gold be sifted out of our coffers by foreign demand.

You remember how the Communists recently told their workers to turn in the money which represented their wartime savings, and get revalued rubles in return. The Soviet rulers were telling their people the simple truth—they did not have any savings. They were paid, in war-time, in inflated money, with no backing. Instead of letting the poison of inflation go all through the economic system, the Communists lanced their economy, drained out the poisoned money, and told their people they were poor and in pain, but cleansed of their infection and ready to start fresh.

The Soviet government has continuously built up its supplies of gold by mining in the Arctic, in the Urals, perhaps by international transactions we know nothing about. I suppose they have a good part of ours.

The United States has taken none of the bloat out of our economic system. Our enterprises were so fantastically productive that our real wealth did increase, but we increased our red-ink spending so fast that the dollar fell to half its value. At the same time we put restrictions on our gold miners so that nothing is added to our supply of mined gold. When gold is drawn out by international trade, we have no way to maintain the balance.

What I am saying is clear.

Everything which leads to deficit spending—and that is what this bill would lead to—is a military handicap to the United States. It is weakening us in preparation for the total war where any strength or weakness may be decisive.

It is incredible silliness for the Federal Government, in its weak financial position, to finance one grand spending project after another—with red ink budgets. It is not silly, but something far more ominous, for the American Government to engage in this continuous welfare spending, with a glaze of defense spending, when the deadly contest with the might of the Soviet Union may be no farther away than tomorrow morning.

SPENDING GOVERNMENTS NOTHING NEW

The problem of restraining the Government from spending as it likes is not new. It is eternal.

We can find all the evidence of why government spending is political decadence in the experience of Athens, of Rome, of France under the kings and the Republic.

The Founding Fathers knew it as an old story.

Jefferson warned:

I place economy among the most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy with liberty, or profusion with servitude. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money, forbids it in the disposition of public money.

We must endeavor to reduce the Government to the practice of rigid economy to avoid burdening the people and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the very principle of government. * * * The multiplication of public offices, increase of expense beyond income, growth of the public debt, are indications soliciting the employment of the pruning knife. * * * It is incumbent on every generation to pay its own debt as it goes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks sundry editorials; two communications from Wilbur Young, State superintendent of public instruction of the State of Indiana; a letter from John C. Lynn, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which opposes this proposed legislation very strenuously; a communication from the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce; and a communication from Clarence Manion, a member of the Indiana State Board of Education and chairman of a special committee which has just completed an 8-month survey of mathematics and science in Indiana schools.

There being no objection, the editorials and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis News of August 9, 1958]

JENNER FEARS UNITED STATES COLLEGE CONTROL

(By Lou Hiner, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Federal direction of college graduates' careers may result from the Federal scholarship program, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, Republican, of Indiana, warned today.

Teeing off on the administration's \$1 billion scholarship aid program, JENNER said: "The real result or objective of the plan is uniform Federal examinations with Federal steering of the students where the Government wants them to go."

He added:

"We want no uniform Federal examinations. This is the leftwing pressure of compulsory uniformity. We want no Federal rosters of who or who are not good students."

Under such a Federal grant program, JENNER said that students soon would "realize they had better say nothing critical of the Federal Government or they'll lose out later."

The administration's proposal is for 20,000 4-year scholarships a year ranging from \$500 to \$1,000 for bright students.

In an interview with the News, the Indiana Republican said:

"No case ever had been made for Federal financing in any part of the educational job, except for short run contributions in federally impacted areas.

"The statistics supporting this Federal contribution program are among the most discredited arguments ever submitted to Congress."

Jenner objected also that the scholarship proposal had been tied in with the Nation's defense program. He said the program was thrown together hastily to achieve under the influence of the Sputniks the same old tired proposals that Congress has withstood time and time again.

Using Indiana as an example of the misstatements of the scholarship advocates, JENNER said they had estimated some 2,000 Hoosier high school pupils had high mathematical ability but no money to go to college.

When the time came for scholarship examinations, however, only 700 pupils competed. There were 199 boys and girls who qualified as "bright" pupils, he said, and of that number there were only 53 who needed financial assistance.

JENNER also praised the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce for setting up a \$50,000 scholarship fund to educate Hoosier boys and girls.

The Senator also criticized the program for being almost entirely slanted toward science.

"Does this mean we are to ignore the other arts?" he asked. "When it comes to a single objective of defeating communism we may find we have a greater need for writers, diplomats, businessmen, lawyers."

He concluded by observing that he has seen "no indication whatever either local or private agencies are unable of understanding or meeting any local crisis in education."

Congressman CHARLES B. BROWNSON, Indianapolis Republican, also spoke out against Federal aid to education, saying it comes before Congress each session in a different disguise.

"Federal aid to education which, today, shows up in a space suit, will appear tomorrow in a surgeon's gown, next year in a professor's robe and the year after that in an engineer's tweed suit," BROWNSON said.

"There is no end to the disguises" available and likewise no end to the spending

possibilities of this masquerade," he concluded.

ANTIDOTE TO FEDERAL AID?

The Senate Labor Committee which approved a \$1,500,000,000 Federal aid to education bill—partly for college scholarships—should have looked first to Indiana.

An effective antidote for the creeping disease of Federal aid to education is being offered by the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce. This group of leading businessmen from all parts of the State has created its own scholarship aid program.

It has been done through establishment of a private foundation incorporated by 17 members which will give scholarships to supplement the resources of high school graduates who wish to go to college. Pupils interested in science and mathematics will receive first attention.

By almost any criterion, the State chamber's program measures up to a sounder and more logical way to aid needy young men and women.

In the matter of economics alone, it is far superior to any Federal program which would be financed entirely from the taxpayers' money, with a loss of about 30 percent in administrative costs.

The State chamber's plan is tailored to the need of Indiana, something that would be impossible in any Federal scholarship program operated by bureaucrats on the remote Potomac.

The private foundation will aid needy pupils in a list selected by a committee appointed by Governor Handley which had made a painstaking survey. It should be pointed out that the survey found that the need was far less acute than had been dramatized by overzealous advocates of Federal aid.

We believe it is significant that industrial and business leaders in Indiana are accepting their responsibilities toward higher education.

It is gratifying that the State chamber of commerce has taken its positive action. As long as there is such leadership in the cause of higher education there will be no reason at all for the meddling hand of Federal bureaucracy to reach into our schools and colleges.

The bill has not received full Senate approval yet. We hope that it never does, for we have a better way in Indiana.

[From the Indianapolis Star]

INDIANA POINTS THE WAY

Despite the increasingly bad condition of the Federal budget, a renewed effort is being made to push an aid-to-education measure through the present Congress. A proposal in the House would cost about \$1,070,000,000. The Senate has a bill which would cost about \$1,500,000,000. Both would project the Federal Government into student selection and curriculums planning in both public schools and institutions of higher learning.

President Eisenhower's backing of the proposition is tempered by his insistence that Federal scholarships for college students should not be as numerous as these bills provide, and that they should be based on need. Both are good points.

The fact of the matter is that the question of need argues against any action at the present time. If scholarships are to be based on need, Congress has no way to determine how many should be provided nor how much money will be required. It has no figures at all—except pure guesses—on how many able students are prevented by shortage of money from going to college. Without this information, an intelligent program cannot be set up.

While the new campaign to push this Federal aid bill through was being launched, further action was being carried out in In-

diana which shows that the Federal program is not needed here at all. We doubt that it is needed elsewhere. The Indiana State Chamber of Commerce announced the establishment of a foundation to help capable and needy students through college. It is making grants totaling about \$37,000 to 51 graduates of Indiana high schools in this year's class who were identified in the Manion committee survey as promising students who did not have enough resources for their first college year. The committee narrowed the field to 54 who had the ability and needed help, out of a starting group of 2,000 based on the estimates of high-school principals. Some of these already had scholarships, which were not enough to bridge the gap. Three subsequently obtained adequate scholarships. The other 51 will be provided the necessary help by the new foundation.

This is an example of the sensible way to help capable students through college. First find out how many have both the ability and the need, and how much the need is. Then meet the need.

Besides being a badly aimed shot at the target of college financial problems, the Federal proposals include substantial other items of teacher training, equipment, and student counseling in the public schools. These are objectionable as Federal intrusions into fields better left to local financing and local control.

Meanwhile, what happened to the highly desirable proposal, advanced in the House by Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, for Federal income tax relief for parents or others carrying the load of college expenses? Here is a plan which would provide quick and sure help directly at the point of need, where the bills are being paid. The concern in Congress for helping to get students through college could be excellently expressed by enacting this measure.

[From the Indianapolis Times]

INDIANA MEETS A "CRISIS"

Indiana's State Chamber of Commerce appears to have coped effectively and adequately this week with another "crisis in education."

Not, to be sure, a very big crisis—no matter what they have been saying about it in Washington, or how many billions of dollars they have been wanting to spend on its solution.

This one, indeed, turned out finally to involve a total of 53 young men and women in Indiana, and a total of \$37,000 in money.

There is a bill pending before Congress just now appropriating more than \$1 billion which is somewhat more than the total taxes of 1 million American families for a whole year to provide college scholarships for outstandingly brilliant young high school graduates. According to its advocates many thousands of such youngsters want to go to college but cannot because they cannot come up with the necessary money.

An Indiana study commission took the standards of scholarship provided by the Federal aid folks and applied them to this year's senior classes in all Indiana high schools. The total number was somewhat smaller than alarmist reports from Washington had been indicating. Then the commission surveyed all the Hoosier youngsters who fell into this select group which would qualify for Federal aid under the pending bill, and took a look at their own college plans.

It found all but 53 of them were going to college on their own, without Federal or any other help from the taxpayers.

Those 53 did have a problem, which some of them were not sure they were going to be able to solve, of meeting their own college expenses.

The Indiana Chamber of Commerce simply set up a fund to take care of all 53, and a

continuing program for meeting like needs in future.

The total cost this year will be \$37,000—none of it tax money. Less, perhaps, than it would cost just to administer and spend the Federal aid proposed for Indiana alone under the legislation now before Congress, before any student got enough aid to buy a notebook.

That takes care of another crisis.

Unfortunately it probably will not be the last. These have been bobbing up incessantly since about 1916 and have been turned down by virtually every session of Congress for the past 50 years. Not always the same crisis, of course. Sometimes it has been shortages of teachers, sometimes of classrooms, sometimes of other educational facilities. So we feel fairly safe in assuming there will be another one next year and still another the year after, and so on, each as phony as the one before it.

Slowly, however, it is beginning to dawn on taxpayers and their Representatives in Congress alike, that the real objective of this whole half-century campaign is to get the Federal Government in control of the schools, as the first step toward control of the minds and the thoughts of the next generation, and nothing more than that.

The Indiana survey has exploded one more in the long series of myths on the subject, and the chamber of commerce program has once again demonstrated their absurdity.

We doubt if the Federal aiders will quit trying, though.

Absurdity has never stopped them before.

[From the Indianapolis Star
of August 7, 1958]

INDIANA POINTS THE WAY

Despite the increasingly bad condition of the Federal budget, a renewed effort is being made to push an aid to education measure through the present Congress. A proposal in the House would cost about \$1,070 million. The Senate has a bill which would cost about \$1,500 million. Both would project the Federal Government into student selection and curricula planning in both public schools and institutions of higher learning.

President Eisenhower's backing of the proposition is tempered by his insistence that Federal scholarships for college students should not be as numerous as these bills provide, and that they should be based on need. Both are good points.

The fact of the matter is that the question of need argues against any action at the present time. If scholarships are to be based on need, Congress has no way to determine how many should be provided nor how much money will be required. It has no figures at all—except pure guesses—on how many able students are prevented by shortage of money from going to college. Without this information, an intelligent program cannot be set up.

While the new campaign to push this Federal aid bill through was being launched, further action was being carried out in Indiana which shows that the Federal program is not needed here at all. We doubt that it is needed elsewhere. The Indiana State Chamber of Commerce announced the establishment of a foundation to help capable and needy students through college. It is making grants totaling about \$37,000 to 51 graduates of Indiana high schools in this year's class who were identified in the Manion committee survey as promising students who did not have enough resources for their first college year. The committee narrowed the field to 54 who had the ability and needed help, out of a starting group of 2,000 based on the estimates of high school principals. Some of these already had scholarships, which were not enough to bridge the gap. Three subsequently ob-

tained adequate scholarships. The other 51 will be provided the necessary help by the new foundation.

This is an example of the sensible way to help capable students through college. First find out how many have both the ability and the need, and how much the need is. Then meet the need.

Besides being a badly aimed shot at the target of college financial problems, the Federal proposals include substantial other items of teacher training, equipment and student counseling in the public schools. These are objectionable as Federal intrusions into fields better left to local financing and local control.

Meanwhile, what happened to the highly desirable proposal, advanced in the House by Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, for Federal income tax relief for parents or others carrying the load of college expenses? Here is a plan which would provide quick and sure help directly at the point of need, where the bills are being paid. The concern in Congress for helping to get students through college could be excellently expressed by enacting this measure.

STATE OF INDIANA,

Indianapolis, August 6, 1958.

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER,

Congress of the United States,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: Last February all of the Indiana high-school principals estimated that there were approximately 2,000 high-school seniors in our State with high ability in mathematics and science who did not have enough money to go to college. When the opportunity presented itself on April 19, and for 1 month later, for any high-school senior to take a comprehensive 4½-hour examination in mathematics, science, English, and social studies; only 703 seniors availed themselves of the opportunity.

We learned, after the tests were machine-scored, that 199 of this group ranked above the 90 percentile in mathematics and science. We eliminated those who stated they had enough money to go to college; intended to major in fields other than mathematics and science; or were eliminated by the need formula. Final results revealed that there were only 53 who qualified for financial aid from \$10 to \$1,200.

The Indiana Chamber of Commerce immediately went into action and raised \$37,000 for the 53 students. Each is now guaranteed a year's work in college as far as finances are concerned.

I am confident if the other States of the Union had made a similar study to the one made in Indiana and had provided the necessary financial effort as was done by the State chamber of commerce, there would be no need for the Federal-aid scholarship bill.

I, therefore, urge you to do all you can to defeat H. R. 13247.

If this legislation becomes a law providing just one scholarship instead of 23,000, a furrow has been broken in fertile prairie territory permitting erosion to take place during the future generations.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR YOUNG,

State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

STATE OF INDIANA,

Indianapolis, August 12, 1958.

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: This editorial from today's (Tuesday's) Indianapolis Star is typical of the reaction throughout Indiana. The people of our State are genuinely aroused by the hodgepodge bill passed by the House, for, as the editorial points out, the Federal schol-

arship proposal is being used as the Trojan horse to impose direct Federal grants on many phases of public education.

The Hoosier Republican delegation voted solidly as their constituents wished and as their own good judgment dictated, particularly in view of the conclusive and irrefutable study made by the Manion committee. I am sure that you will do everything possible—not only at the time of any voting but long before—to stop this nefarious bill in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR YOUNG,
State Superintendent of Public
Instruction.

AID SHOWS ITS COLORS

In their eagerness to get a bill passed by the House, the promoters of Federal aid to education laid their objectives out in the open. The measure which has so energetically been promoted as a scholarship plan was passed by the House—without the scholarships.

If the Senate should pass a scholarship bill, perhaps scholarships could be put back into a final measure in conference committee. But that will be a matter of small concern to the Federal aid group. They have what they want in the bill which passed the House. They have a program of grants to public schools for purchase of equipment for specified types of educational programs. They have a program of grants to be used in teacher training. They have a program of federally supervised student counseling and guidance in the public schools. These are what the Federal aid promoters want—the devices of Federal intervention in the operation and direction of the public schools.

The bill which passed the House does contain a loan program for the aid of students in college. But the probable impact of this program is, we think, grossly overestimated. We suspect that it would have been sacrificed just as readily as the scholarships plan was tossed out, if it had been necessary to get the public school intervention bill through.

The nine Republican Representatives from Indiana deserve credit for supporting an unsuccessful attempt to kill the bill by sending it back to the Education Committee. We commend them for that. We don't quite understand, though, why they then curled up and permitted the measure to be passed without a record vote.

The only chance of saving the Nation's school systems from this assault now rests with the Senate. We hope cooler heads will be in the majority there. If they needed any help in seeing the proposition clearly, the House has provided such help. During House debate the measure was referred to as "a crazy bill," and "a hydraheaded monstrosity." The accuracy of those terms was more than ever obvious when the House got through with the bill.

The Senate can preserve sanity in this matter by rejecting this barefaced bid for Federal strings on the public schools.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., August 12, 1958.

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: The American Farm Bureau Federation is opposed to S. 4237 and the program of Federal scholarships, student loans, and the other forms of Federal aid to general education contained in the proposal. This program involves the beginning of Federal intervention and control in the operation of our public educational system. We believe the needs of our public education system can best be met through the utilization of State and local funds and resources.

While creative and research talent is always in short supply, there is ample evi-

dence that our technically trained manpower supply, if properly and fully utilized, is adequate for both our economic and military needs. The real question is how we utilize the engineering and scientific talent we have available, not how we quickly develop such talent. We do not believe that the program of Federal assistance to education proposed in S. 4237 will necessarily provide any better utilization of our scientific and engineering resources.

With the Federal debt at an all time high, the farm bureau believes this is no time to embark on a new Federal spending program for education. Federal aid will not solve our educational problems.

We urge that you oppose the passage of S. 4237.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director.

INDIANA STATE
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Indianapolis, August 6, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate, Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I think you will be interested in the enclosed copy of the news release which was given to newspapers and press associations the afternoon the State chamber's new educational foundation was established (Monday, August 4). It puts some emphasis on phases of the foundation's purposes which we believe to be just as important as the making of scholarship loans to qualified students who cannot get aid through already existing scholarship grants or loan funds.

As noted in the news release, the new foundation will: First, "work with Indiana colleges and universities and local organizations to help high-school students locate existing scholarships or loan funds."

The State superintendent's study committee found instances where students had failed to find financial aid simply because the students didn't know how to get the information. When establishment of the foundation was being discussed by our board, 1 member said there was a fund already existing which could take care of 3 qualified students from his own county (Howard) who had been listed by the committee. By acting as a clearinghouse through which students and sources of financial aid can be brought together, we feel the foundation can serve one of its most useful purposes.

The second purpose of the foundation is "to encourage establishment of additional local student-aid programs by civic groups and businesses in Hoosier communities."

We believe that as our program develops we can create a greater feeling of local responsibility than now exists for providing aid to outstanding students in the community who need it.

The third purpose is "to establish a loan fund from which to finance the higher education of qualified students who cannot obtain aid from other sources."

This final purpose is designed to assure that no Hoosier student who meets the scholastic qualifications, and cannot obtain needed aid from other sources, will be denied the opportunity to go to college because of lack of finances.

You will note in our release that for this first year the foundation will make loans only to the math and science specialists found by the State superintendent's office to be in need of financial help. There just isn't time to set up our own qualification procedures between now and the opening of fall college terms. The program probably will be expanded to other fields next year.

In our studies preceding establishment of our foundation, we learned that there are at least two similar programs in other States (Maine and Massachusetts). There may be others.

Certainly the official Indiana survey of the State superintendent of public instruction showed how grossly exaggerated are the claims of those who want to put the Federal Government—already debt ridden and operating at a deficit—into the scholarship and school business as a "defense" measure. These things are the responsibility of private individuals, the States, and communities, and we want to keep that responsibility in Indiana.

I hope that you, and others who think as you and we do, can stop once more the people who continually want to use Federal aid as a means to get their hands on the institutions which educate American youth.

Cordially yours,

JACK E. REICH,
Executive Vice President.

RELEASE FROM INDIANA STATE CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE

Creation of a foundation to assist qualified Hoosier students in financing college education was announced today by the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce following a meeting of its board of directors at the Indianapolis Athletic Club.

For the first year, aid will be limited to high school graduates intending to major in science and mathematics. In subsequent years, other fields of education may be included, according to Clarence A. Jackson, State chamber president.

Purposes of the new foundation, Mr. Jackson said, will be:

1. To work with Indiana colleges and universities and local organizations to help high school students locate existing scholarships or loan funds for which they are qualified;
2. To encourage establishment of additional local student-aid programs by civic groups and businesses in Hoosier communities;
3. To establish a loan fund from which to finance the higher education of qualified students who cannot obtain aid from other sources.

Foundation funds will be raised independently of the normal membership funds of the State chamber and the foundation will function as a separate nonprofit corporation.

Scholastic requirements will be established and eligibility for aid will be determined by an advisory committee of educators. Standards of "need" for financial aid probably will follow those already set up by the State's various educational institutions, Mr. Jackson said.

Glenn W. Thompson of Columbus, a past president of the State Chamber and president of the DePauw University board of trustees, was elected president of the foundation. J. Ralph Thompson of Seymour, vice president of the Purdue board of trustees, was elected vice president. Other officers are Otto N. Frenzel of Indianapolis, treasurer, and Jack E. Reich, executive vice president of the chamber, secretary. Lothair Teetor of Hagerstown was named fund raising chairman.

The chamber president said because of shortness of time the students who will be considered for assistance in the fall term this year will be limited to the 53 scholastically qualified high school graduates found by a recent survey of the State superintendent of public instruction to be in need of additional help to finance college education in science and mathematics.

Clarence E. Manion of South Bend, chairman of a special State chamber committee which recommended establishment of the new foundation and also chairman of the official committee named by State school superintendent Wilbur Young to survey needs for science and mathematics scholarships, said instances had been found of existing funds going begging "because students and the sources of financial aid had not been brought together."

The foundation sponsored by the State chamber plans to act as a clearinghouse for information on scholarships and other types of aid available to qualified students, thus permitting parents and students to obtain this information more easily.

"The official survey in Indiana," Mr. Jackson said, "already has proved there is no need for the federally financed scholarships proposed in a bill now in Congress under the phony label of 'defense measure.' The new foundation is designed to plug with Indiana resources the very small gap not filled by current aid programs for outstanding students."

Directors of the new corporation, in addition to the officers, are R. H. McMurtrie of Huntingburg, Fred M. Crapo of Muncie, Floyd A. Hines of Connersville, George C. Carroll of Terre Haute, Paul W. Kerr of Elkhart, Mr. Teetor, and C. Harvey Bradley, E. B. Newill, Harry T. Ice and Mr. Jackson all of Indianapolis.

Other incorporators of the new foundation are Alden P. Chester and James R. Cypher of Kokomo, Charles B. Enlow and John R. Ibach of Evansville, Welby M. Frantz of Terre Haute, Clifford F. Payne of New Castle, Joseph A. Osborn of Marion, F. E. Schouweller of Fort Wayne and Joseph L. Hanna, George S. Olive and Ottis T. Fitzwater all of Indianapolis. All foundation directors and incorporators are members of the board of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce.

AUGUST 6, 1958.

Day letter to:
 Senator STYLES BRIDGES,
 Senator HOMER CAPEHART,
 Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND,
 Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
 Senator EDWARD MARTIN,
 Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
 Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,
 Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
 Senator HARRY BYRD,
 Senator GEORGE W. MALONE:

I hope that you will vote against the proposed Federal scholarship bill. I am a member of the Indiana State Board of Education and chairman of a special committee that has just completed an 8-month survey of mathematics and science in Indiana schools. Our statewide examination and screening found only 53 qualified high-school graduates who need financial aid in order to go to college next September. All these have now been given the necessary aid from private sources. I am sure that a similar effort would show the same result in every State of the Union. Indiana schools do not need Federal aid and do not want the Federal control that always goes with Federal aid. The Federal budget is now running \$1 billion into the red every month. Surely this is no time to vote another billion for a need that has not been clearly demonstrated. Continued deficit spending is destroying the value of 90 million savings accounts. Please give these millions of people a break. Urge your colleagues to stop the spending, adjourn Congress, and go home.

Cordially,

CLARENCE MANION.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the amendment to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to urge the adoption of the school construction amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] to the scholarship bill, S. 4237, now under consideration.

As one of the sponsors of S. 3311, which was designed to provide adequate classroom facilities and a program for necessary teachers, I realize how meager this proposed amendment is. Years of inadequate financial support, added to

the great increase in enrollment in our schools, has created a tremendous shortage of classrooms as well as a shortage of qualified teachers.

The latest calculation of the Office of Education shows that there is a continuing shortage of approximately 140,000 classrooms in the United States. Added to this there is a vast need for additional qualified teachers.

Despite the efforts by States and local communities to build schools and increase teachers' salaries, this national shortage of classrooms and teachers continues and requires emergency action on the part of the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. President, while we can all agree that education is chiefly a function of the States and local communities, we must not ignore the fact that the Federal Government has a real responsibility to see that every American child has an opportunity to get an adequate education. The great need for this legislation will not disappear until Congress takes action.

The Soviet Union spends twice as much of its national income on education as the United States does. How can this nation match—much less surpass—the Soviet Union if we continue to deny American boys and girls the good fundamental education which they must have at the elementary and high school level in order to become scientists and technicians?

Mr. President, there is no question of doubt that this program is basic to any program for the training of scientists and technicians to meet the threat to our national security.

We held hearings in the education subcommittee on S. 3311, which would provide aid for either schoolroom construction or teacher salaries. The States could divide up the money between those two needs as they saw fit. To evade this responsibility in the face of the admitted conditions established at our hearings and acknowledged throughout the country will constitute a major error in the record of this Congress. We developed in these hearings documentation for a much greater program than is envisioned in the modest proposal now under consideration.

The Office of Education advised me this week that it now costs approximately \$40,000 for construction of a classroom and related facilities. With the shortage of 140,000 classrooms recognized by the administration, this means that approximately \$5.6 billion is required merely to take care of the present shortage.

The amendment now under consideration would provide no more than \$2 billion in Federal funds, over a 2-year period. When supplemented by local funds, the entire amount would not provide for the present need, not to mention future needs.

Furthermore, this amendment would do nothing to provide supplementary income for teachers, many of whom are grossly underpaid and who consequently turn to more remunerative jobs.

This, then, is a modest proposal, an inadequate proposal; but it is a beginning, Mr. President, and I say it is long past time when the Senate should meet

its responsibility to the schoolchildren of America.

Witnesses from the chamber of commerce appearing before our subcommittee admitted, in answer to questions, that their organization has worked for subsidies for various big-business interests. I am for subsidies, too, where they are necessary for our national welfare; but I am for a subsidy also for education, and this Congress has an obligation to act on this matter which we have been sidestepping for years.

What we are seeking to provide by this amendment is far from sufficient to meet the needs established by the hearings, but it is all that we can expect to accomplish at this session of the Congress. In the coming session, the Congress should give priority to this matter in view of the very serious conditions existing in our schools.

Mr. President, I submit that the pending amendment should be approved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the senior Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 1 minute on the bill. I wish to commend my distinguished senior colleague and former chairman of the committee, for the statement he has made. He has spoken for the full Montana delegation, and the Record should show that his remarks have the endorsement of all members of that delegation.

I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of S. 4237, the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and his colleagues on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee merit our profound thanks for getting this bill to us in such form as to permit action before adjournment.

It would have been a major disservice to the national interest if this Congress had adjourned before giving the country some concrete programs to help revitalize our learning in the sciences and in the humanities.

The Soviet Union confronts us today with an all-out, across-the-board competition. Moscow is determined to reach and overreach this country not only in military strength and in science, but in industrial production, world trade, propaganda, and diplomacy as well.

To meet the total challenge our Nation needs the ablest minds and the most creative skills it can muster—both in the sciences and in the humanities.

Yet for some time this country has frittered away its intellectual assets. We have neglected our schools and our teachers, and we have failed to make adequate provision for higher education and for basic research.

In this respect, the fathers of our country were far more realistic than our generation has been. Washington, Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, and James Madison, and others of our early statesmen, saw clearly that knowledge and the application of science and intelligence

were essential to the fulfillment of the promises of this great continent and to the development of national strength.

The dangers of neglecting learning in the modern world were prophetically stated by Alfred North Whitehead in 1916, in these words:

In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute; the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, nor all your wit, nor all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will be pronounced on the uneducated.

Certainly the path we are traveling today leads to the reassessment of the value we, as a people, place on learning.

Sputnik was the shock treatment. For the past 10 months this country has been engaged in a great reexamination of the state of American knowledge and education.

In the light of the glaring deficiencies exposed by this national self-appraisal, the bill before us today is a minimum, a beginning.

I am glad that the present bill places special emphasis on science training.

Ten years ago, there was no question where the best scientists in the world could be found—here in the United States. Today, authoritative voices tell us that 10 years from now the best scientists in the world will be found in Russia.

For the first time in our history, we are losing scientific races for discovery that we wanted to win. In one critical scientific project after another our problem is no longer how to stay ahead. It is how to catch up.

We now see that we will fall further and further behind unless steps are taken to bolster our scientific and technical potential.

The national-defense scholarships and loans provided in this bill should encourage and help more of our promising talent to embark on scientific careers. I hope that the proposed number of scholarships—approximately 23,000—will not be reduced. I understand that the President would prefer arrangements for only 10,000 scholarships. I cannot believe that the Senate will go along with this reduction.

Each year about 200,000 American high-school students who could profit by college do not go to college. According to recent studies, as many as 150,000 of these might have gone to college had adequate financial support been offered them.

Even the 23,000 scholarships provided in this bill will only salvage a minute percentage of the able high-school talent now lost to college each year.

I am glad that the pending bill is not exclusively devoted to science, and that it recognizes the need to revitalize certain areas of humanistic studies, particularly the study of foreign languages.

Obviously, it is not enough just to train more scientists to teach the facts and methods and inculcate the attitudes of the laboratory—indispensable as these may be. Science can build us

rockets, but it cannot tell us whether they will go to Moscow or the moon. Science gives us amazing implements to use, but cannot assure us they will be used for the benefit of mankind.

Moreover, in this period of the cold war, we need above all the tools to work effectively with other peoples. Moscow intends, if it can, to inherit the world by drawing more and more people into its orbit. A major part of our task is to hold the free world together and help keep the uncommitted peoples from slipping behind the Iron Curtain. For this undertaking there is no more important skill than an understanding of foreign languages.

Yet, in this area, we are not even assuring ourselves the minimum tools. Compared to the Soviet Union we are doing a fifth-rate job in language training.

For example, Telegu is the language of 33 million people in India who live in an area where communism has made substantial inroads. Yet not six people in this country can read a newspaper in Telegu. Members of a Soviet delegation, however, arriving in India can speak Telegu and read it.

Fifty percent of our entire Foreign Service Corps do not have a speaking knowledge of even one foreign language. Furthermore, our Ambassador in Moscow is the only United States Ambassador in a Communist country who speaks the language of the country to which he is assigned.

The language development projects included in this bill can encourage more intensive study of foreign languages. We must recognize, however, that these projects are only a small start on an adequate language program.

Both public and private efforts to improve and broaden our language studies are too haphazard and disjointed to turn back the rising tide of ignorance in the modern-language field. We need a far-sighted national leadership and direction that will spur and coordinate the many efforts in this field.

There has been a great deal of talk about the need for a greater flow of first-class talent into the sciences and humanities. At last, with this bill, Congress is moving toward a program to give this talent the stimulation and encouragement it deserves.

The central question now is whether we will make the most of these first steps in revitalizing American learning. Or will we lapse back into indifference and let even these first steps falter.

Mr. President, I urge prompt and favorable action on this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address prepared by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on the bill now under consideration be read by the legislative clerk. I make this request for the reason heretofore given.

There being no objection, the legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am a co-sponsor of S. 4237, the National Defense Education Bill, reported by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee under the very able chairmanship of my

colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I take this opportunity to commend the chairman and the members of the committee for bringing to the Senate floor a bill which I consider to be one of the most important with which this body has dealt in this session of Congress. The distinguished Senator from Alabama, under great difficulty, has rendered a great service to the country in bringing before us this bill.

I will support this measure with all the vigor I possess. It is imperative that it be enacted. I would be less than frank, however, if I did not voice the deep concern I feel that this bill does not go far enough in meeting basic needs of our educational system.

Lest my remarks be interpreted as being critical of the bill, may I stress that I believe this is an essential step in meeting our immediate needs in the scientific field. It is the first significant measure to come before us this session to help the nation meet the challenge of Soviet scientific achievements.

But my thesis, Mr. President, is that we must recognize that this bill is only a step in the right direction. It is excellent as far as it goes. It does not, however, meet the problem which this body dare not lose sight of, and that is the problem of what we intend to do about the deplorable conditions which exist in our educational system at the primary and secondary levels.

A scholarship program of this nature is good; it is needed; but if we fail to train individuals who are competent to avail themselves of the opportunities offered by such a proposal, it will be of little benefit. So, I maintain, Mr. President, that while this bill may provide the tools to repair the hole in the roof, so to speak, it does nothing to supply the materials needed to repair the shaky foundation, which is basic to the entire structure.

The basic training of our future scientists, engineers, educators, and professionals must be adequate if they are to assume the responsibilities required of them in our social system. This training cannot be adequate so long as we continue to ignore primary education.

There is no dearth of facts pointing to the conclusion that we have not met our obligations in providing assistance to primary and secondary education. It has been estimated conservatively that this Nation has a present shortage of 140,000 classrooms, and there is no possibility that this shortage will diminish in the ensuing years; rather, with our exploding school age population, we can look forward to more critical shortages in the future.

It is anticipated that we will witness this year an enrollment of 35 million students in our primary and secondary schools, and the experts predict this enrollment will increase 10 percent by the year 1965. Mr. President, in my estimation, it is nothing short of sheer folly for the Congress to continue to close its eyes to these facts.

I shall not take more of the Senate's valuable time to further expound on why I feel our position regarding education

is grim. It is grim for a number of reasons—primarily because we are faced with a grave challenge in this area from the Soviet Union. Members of the Senate know of the accomplishments of the Russians. They were brought to our attention by Sputnik I, and I have no doubt that we now all realize that Sputnik I was not merely a pie in the sky or a bauble.

While there was a great flurry in the Congress, immediately following the announcement of this scientific marvel, to get on with the business of remedying our educational ills, much time has elapsed and our accomplishments to date add up to nothing.

I recall a statement I made in January of this year, when I expressed the thought that it would be a great tragedy if we permitted an opportunity to pass without doing something more fundamental for our educational system than adopting a scholarship program merely to provide assistance at the college level.

Mr. President, I will support, for that reason, the amendment offered to this bill by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. His amendment would provide to the States, on a matching basis, \$2 billion over the next 2 years for classroom construction. Adoption of this amendment by the Congress would permit construction throughout the Nation of 105,000 classrooms. This would still be inadequate to meet our present classroom needs, but it would be a beginning. I share Senator McNAMARA's concern about our failure to enact legislation for classroom construction and commend him for making consideration of such an amendment possible. I shall support it, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. If we do not avail ourselves of this opportunity, we may soon regret it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. School buildings are needed if there is to be school education. Just last year, the administration was agreeing with us about the classroom shortage to the extent of giving half-hearted support to a construction bill. Now it has abandoned that program, without, of course, giving any indication that Federal assistance is no longer needed. It did not because it cannot. At the opening of the school year, the Nation required about 200,000 new classrooms to meet new enrollments and replace obsolete buildings. The States are building about 60,000 new classrooms a year, thereby keeping up with new enrollments but making only a small dent in the backlog of construction needs.

I can think of no more worthwhile public-works program than one of school construction. The bill I sponsored last year with Senator CLARK, S. 1134, and the new bill introduced by Senator MURRAY and cosponsored by myself and many others would include school construction among the uses to which the Federal grants could be put. Senator PROXMIER, of Wisconsin, this year joined us as a cosponsor of S. 1134.

To those who still cling to the old notion that Federal assistance would lead to Federal control, I remind them of the history of Federal school construction. A great many people have forgotten that school buildings were among the major projects built by the Federal Government during the depression of the 1930's. In the 1955 report on Federal Aid for School Construction by the Library of Congress, there is contained a summary of the activities of the Public Works Administration and the Works Projects Administration. PWA made its grants to the localities to use for the construction they needed most. From 1933 through 1942, PWA made allotments for 6,687 elementary and secondary schools, costing over \$979 million. Every State of the Union participated in this program. School buildings comprised 40 percent of all non-Federal projects for which PWA made allotments.

Every Senator, in other words, has schools in his State that were built with Federal grants in the 1930's. Can any one of them show where any Federal control of teaching methods or curriculums has resulted? Can anyone point to a single school in this country built with PWA funds and say that it fell under Federal domination because Federal money helped build it?

Then we have WPA schools. The WPA did not make grants to the localities or States, but built its projects directly. Over a period of 8 years, more than 5,900 new school were built, and more than 33,000 others were modernized, under WPA, at a cost of \$466,700,000 of the Federal taxpayers' money for school construction.

The Senator from Michigan is not talking about a new program; he is talking about carrying out a program which is well established in the policies of this Nation.

Can any Senator who is opposing Federal aid because of fear of Federal control point to any WPA-constructed school and say that it is now being run or dominated by the Federal Government?

The same record can be shown for Public Law 815, under which Federal money is provided to build schools in the so-called federally impacted areas.

I think the record already made on Federal funds for school construction puts to rest these fears of Federal control of the schools of America.

In fact, I digress to point out that millions of dollars have poured into the States over many, many years for the so-called land-grant colleges under the Morrill Act.

Does any Senator want to tell me that any State college in his State is dominated by the Federal Government because it has been the recipient of great sums of money over the years?

Of course, the answer is that such a charge is nonsense. It is pure nonsense. It is a fear argument. It is a scarecrow that is being built up in the communities of America, with the result that timid politicians too frequently are following this propaganda line, and unwittingly, I am sure, but nevertheless ef-

fectively, denying to American boys and girls the educational opportunities that I think are their heritage.

I have said before, and I repeat this afternoon, we cannot let the educational opportunities of American boys and girls be dependent upon an act of God. The place of birth of an American boy and girl is an act of God.

I take the position that every American boy and girl, wherever born in this country, is deserving of an equal chance for the maximum development of his or her brain potential. That is basic in this whole philosophy that I have been fighting for, along with other wonderful colleagues in the Senate, for decent Federal aid to education for many years past.

Mr. President, we cannot have an educational system without having adequate physical facilities. Certainly teachers are needed. As I shall say in connection with another amendment, I am in support of aid to teachers; but we are confronted also with a need for school buildings. I think we should have the political courage in the Senate of the United States to take back home to the people of our States a Federal aid to education law which will include authorization for the appropriation of a good many millions of dollars—yes; I am willing to say that we can well afford to spend from \$2 billion to \$3 billion—for schools, and can justify it entirely on the ground of defense.

I remind the Senate that a nation can be no stronger than its trained brainpower. We had better make certain that we stop wasting human values by inadequate education facilities for our boys and girls.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I join in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. I associate myself with the remarks just made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I do not think any program is more vitally needed than Federal assistance for school construction. The bill before the Senate represents very long and dedicated effort by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I believe the bill can be strengthened by adding to it the funds which the Senator from Michigan has proposed, to provide for substantial assistance for the construction of needed school buildings throughout the country.

I think anyone who has observed conditions, even in some of the richer States of the Nation, including the States of the Northeast, and who has noted the steady attrition in the number of schoolrooms in comparison with the increasing population, realizes that any effective school assistance program must include not only scholarships and the other assistance provided in the bill, but also some assistance for the development of more schoolrooms for the children.

In most of the communities of the Nation the property tax is already overburdening. The property tax in the city of Boston is now about \$82 a \$1,000. The rate is going up in almost every com-

munity in Massachusetts. In the next couple of years the average rate will be between \$75 and \$80, and may go as high as \$100.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. For that reason, again and again we have seen a refusal and a reluctance on the part of the people who live in the cities to approve bond issues, because already the property tax is heavily mortgaged in those areas.

I think the only source of taxation which can make a breakthrough in the area of assistance for schools in the next few years is the Federal tax, which will afford an opportunity to raise the needed funds for school construction.

I think it is important, as we face up to the problem of education, to consider also funds for school construction. I believe it is of vital importance to the national defense and also of vital importance to the maintenance of democracy. Democracy involves the maintenance of the intelligence of our population. I want to make certain that our population will be as intelligent as we can possibly make it. That will involve the providing of adequate schoolrooms, and good teachers at good pay.

I think we shall be taking a step in that direction when we accept the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], which I support.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me—with the understanding that, in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor—in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CLARK. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time, I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time required therefor charged to the time available to either side under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield the floor at this time—

Mr. CLARK. I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] 20 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 20 minutes on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a bill which will be remembered as one of the great pieces of legislation of the 85th Congress. All of us are very much indebted to him for his leadership in the field of education, as well as for his leadership in the field of health.

I am convinced that this measure, which provides a comprehensive, statesmanlike approach to the problems presented by the grave educational crisis of our times, will be remembered as one of the historic accomplishments of the senior Senator from Alabama, whose name already is enshrined in millions of hearts as the father of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and all the other members of the committee for the splendid report on Senate bill 4237 and for the drafting of the national defense educational bill—a landmark in American educational history. The bill reported by the committee is, of course, much better than the bill recommended by the administration.

The committee's report is brief and eloquent. It is a document of great importance. I have read it with intense interest; and I strongly support its conclusions.

In only one area of the program provided by the bill do I differ in the slightest with the recommendations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I refer to what I consider to be perhaps the most important title of the bill—title II, providing for 23,000 scholarships annually for outstanding students.

My colleagues may recall that in January, 1957, I proposed legislation which included a proposal for 40,000 scholarships, based on the fact that each year there are between 150,000 and 200,000 gifted young men and women who, because of a lack of financial means, cannot take college training. My proposal was designed to make it possible for at least one-fourth to one-fifth of these fine young men and women to qualify for scholarships. Because of the financial situation of their families, many of these students are in such straitened financial circumstances that they could not even consider applying for long-term, low-interest-rate loans.

I consider the 40,000 scholarships to be a modest number.

Mr. President, the 23,000-scholarships program provided for in the bill as reported by the committee would provide an average of 1 scholarship for each American high school—or about 1½ scholarships per 100 high school graduates.

The cost of providing 23,000 such scholarships is estimated at \$17.5 million. When compared with the cost of building 1 capital ship or 1 squadron of jet bombers or 1 Reserve Forces airbase, this is a tiny amount to be devoted to the search for brilliant young minds.

I propose, Mr. President, that we should have—not an average of 1

such scholarship per high school—but, instead, an average of 2 per high school. This would mean that we should provide in the bill for 46,000 scholarships rather than for the 23,000 presently proposed. Therefore, Mr. President, at the appropriate time I shall submit an amendment which will increase the amount in title II of the bill from \$17.5 million to \$35 million.

Mr. President, I was truly shocked to hear of the action taken last week by the House of Representatives, on a division vote—with very few Members on the floor—to strike all of title II from the House version of the national defense education bill. Thus, the scholarship bill was left without scholarships. That was an amazing spectacle. First, the President requested, this year, the passage of a bill which called for only 10,000 scholarships—a number so small as to amount to little more than a token gesture in the direction of an effective scholarship program. Then members of his own party—in fact, members of his own wing of the Republican Party—have the audacity to say that it would weaken the fiber of American youth to permit them to receive scholarships, rather than loans.

In the debate on the amendment which struck the scholarship provision from the House bill, it was brought out that the author of that unfortunate amendment had himself, in the 83d Congress, proposed successfully a scholarship bill for students of Korean or Nationalist Chinese background.

By the way, Mr. President, that is commendable; but if it is commendable for students of Korean and students of National Chinese background, certainly it is also commendable for American citizens.

It takes a curious twist of logic, Mr. President, to justify a scholarship program for Chinese and Korean youth—and I favor such a program—and at the same time to argue that similar scholarships would weaken the fiber of American youth. Such an argument is sheer sophistry.

The loan program provided in title III of the bill is a splendid program which will provide needed opportunities to many students with fine minds, particularly students who are what we call late starters, who do not receive the spark of intellectual stimulus until somewhat later than many others. Perhaps the schools they attended were somewhat inferior, and therefore did not give them sufficient preparation to enable them to become eligible to receive scholarships. I am particularly pleased to find that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare retained my proposal, of early 1957, to permit graduates who enter the teaching professions to write off, at the rate of 20 percent a year, their loans under title III of the bill. Thus, in 5 years, no debt would be remaining. I firmly believe this provision will greatly strengthen the numbers and the quality of our elementary and secondary schoolteachers, who are, indeed, the foundation of our educational system.

The scholarship provision in title II, however, is essentially an incentive program. Within the educational system of

our country, it can act as a catalyst to accelerate the improvement of teaching standards; the provision of better equipment for teaching in the sciences, mathematics and languages; and more intensive participation by parents in their children's educational careers.

I view this program, Mr. President, as a stimulus to the raising of scholastic standards throughout the United States.

I believe that in our consideration of the scholarship program, we should have at least that point in mind; namely, that it will tend to stimulate greater national interest in the entire educational structure of the Nation, and also will promote the educational advancement of brilliant students who have graduated from the secondary schools.

I am very much pleased that the committee has provided that the first \$500 of the scholarship shall be awarded solely on the basis of merit. A scholarship not only is a monetary award, but also, is an award of prestige, honor, and recognition.

How wonderful it is that, at long last, in America the Government wishes to honor the intelligence and intellectual competence, and proposes to do so by means of scholarships made available by the Congress of the United States.

The students who win scholarships, the parents of those students, and the high schools and the communities will share in the pride of achievement.

Mr. President, I consider the scholarship provision to be the peak of the pyramid or the keystone in the arch of educational excellence which we are trying to build today. The whole objective of the national defense education bill, so far as I am concerned, is to provide every opportunity for gifted American students to develop their talents to the very fullest, and eventually to participate in the leadership of our Nation in every area—in business, in Government, in the professions, in every field of effort in our society.

Mr. President, if we make it possible for even 1 or 2 creative individuals of the first rank to rise from obscurity and to take the place of the Einsteins, the Fermis, the Roosevelts, the Salks, the investment the Nation is making through this bill will be eminently worthwhile. Such trained intellects are priceless. There is simply no monetary value that can be assigned to them. All that we can know is that the investment in education which this bill constitutes is a tiny fraction of the value of uncovering and encouraging the gifted leaders of the next generation.

To conclude, Mr. President, I strongly support the National Defense Education bill. It is one of the great pieces of legislation of the 85th Congress. Yet, it is saddening that a failure on the part of the administration to request a program for Federal aid for school construction was not received in this session of Congress.

Federal aid for school construction was not included in the National Defense Education bill, I feel sure, because of the feeling that its inclusion would jeopardize the passage of the entire bill.

Nevertheless, I have joined in the sponsorship of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], which would provide a school construction program. I believe his amendment represents a minimum requirement, but is a most constructive approach to the problem. I have consistently fought for the program of Federal assistance for school construction.

It was my privilege to sit in the very first hearing on Federal aid to school construction, in 1949. As a result of those hearings, there was enacted into a law a bill to provide Federal assistance for school construction in areas affected by Federal activities. Under that bill, millions of dollars were made available for school construction. I cite the record to prove that there has not been one instance of Federal interference or control, but there have been examples of fine schools constructed for growing communities.

It was a bitter disappointment that the bill passed last year was defeated in the House, due to a lack of administration effort and the usual opposition. Doubtless the administration's timidity and other circumstances will again make impossible a school construction bill during this session. Nevertheless, I feel that the record should be clear, that school construction is a prime objective—of equal importance, but not more important than the provisions of the National Defense education bill. We need both bills, and while we are on the very threshold of achieving one great effort in education, we should not permit it to be said that the Congress, like the administration, did not consider Federal aid for school construction sufficiently important for consideration on the Senate floor during this session of Congress.

I wish to join and be associated with other Senators who have expressed commendation of the Senator from Michigan in his effort to bring forth a school construction assistance program as a fundamental part of the bill. Earlier today I commended the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for the fine record which has been established in bringing this bill out of committee.

When one reviews the testimony, comprising 1602 pages, on the necessity for a science education national defense bill, there is no doubt about the necessity for such a program.

By the way, every important military official of our Government has testified in favor of the bill. Every important general and admiral, including the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has testified in favor of it. The Secretary of Defense has testified for the National Defense Education bill. I had been in telephonic communication with the Department of Defense prior to my presentation today. I can say for the Record that the Secretary of Defense considers the program embodied in the National Defense Education Act to be as vital to the national security as any discovery which could be made in the field of science or any amount of military power

Congress could mobilize through authorizations and appropriations.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have several questions to ask the distinguished Senator. I know he is well informed on this matter. I have no disagreement with his general conclusion. First, the bill and the amendment are only authorizations? Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. That means there would be no money available under the bill unless appropriations were made next year. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senate could pass the bill this week—and I think it can pass it tonight—inasmuch as a similar bill has passed the House, the bill would have to go to conference, because, as I understand, the House struck out the scholarship provision. Because both Houses realize the urgency of the matter, I believe the national defense education bill can be enacted this week. Next week I am sure at least the preliminary appropriations necessary to put the program into effect could be provided. That is my personal opinion. I have the feeling that the leadership of both Houses of Congress, those responsible for both authorizations and appropriations, want to see this program underway, and I believe they will get it underway.

Mr. WILEY. I have no dispute with that conclusion. The only point I wanted to make, and I think the Senator has answered my question, is that this is an authorization. Unless appropriations were provided this week, or in succeeding weeks of this session, for a part or all of the bill, the money would not be available. What I have in mind is that the people of the country, particularly those who are very much in favor of the program, must realize the situation, so that in the event appropriations are not provided they will not feel something has been done which is not correct. Merely providing an authorization does not mean the appropriate committee will provide \$3 billion in appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct in that statement, even though I must say that if the authorization bill is enacted, I am sure the Members of Congress will find it within their means, hearts, and time to do something to get the program underway, at least on a minimum standard.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator is right, that the majority of Congress wants a part of the program. The House has indicated it did not want a certain part of it. The significance of the matter is that this bill is an authorization bill, and unless an appropriation can be obtained, there will not be a fulfillment of the purpose of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, a while ago I mentioned that every important military officer testified in favor of the bill. I should like to make it quite clear that not only military officers testified in favor of the bill, but great scientists, im-

portant educators, civic leaders, and persons in all walks of life appeared before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—indeed, before other committees of Congress—urging the enactment of this bill.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate that on February 3, 1958, Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified on the bill. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] asked General Twining this question:

Do you think that a substantial effort directed to increasing the quality of our educational system would tend to improve our military posture relative to the Soviet Union?

General Twining, our No. 1 military officer, replied:

I think that is probably the most important thing this country can do.

That was not a conditional answer; it was an unqualified statement.

General Twining went on to say:

I started a campaign a couple of years ago to say in every speech I made something to the effect that we must get our schools on a better standard.

Without taking the time of the Senate unduly, I may say there are more than 2 pages of testimony by the distinguished general of the Air Force, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, if we would go to the teachers of America, if we would go to the school boards of America, if we would go to the civic leaders of America, we would find they have been pleading for this program for months. What was once merely an issue to be discussed in Congress and what was once merely a desire on the part of the American people to improve their schools is now a national imperative. This is a matter of the utmost urgency. This has become an emergency rather than simply a subject for legislative debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, when the committee report on the proposed legislation was published it contained my views in 3 short paragraphs on page 55. I stated:

This bill and the foregoing remarks of the majority remind me of an old Arabian proverb:

If the camel once get his nose in the tent, his body will soon follow.

If adopted, the legislation will mark the inception of aid, supervision, and ultimately control of education in this country by Federal authorities.

Mr. President, one of the greatest myths current in this country is the supposition that our primary education

system is being starved, or at least that the Federal Government or the public has been stingy or neglectful in supporting the education of our children, and that our educational system is badly undernourished.

Now, the fact is, Mr. President, that the American people are willing to pay for good schools and schooling and they have paid well for them for many years. They have paid for better schooling than their children have received in many instances.

The distorted picture which some groups have inflicted upon the people has been demolished by a survey which the magazine *National Review*, of July 5, 1958, terms "the hottest thing on the subject in years." This survey—a copy of which I hold in my hand in book form—is by the well-known authority, Roger A. Freeman. This book, crammed with facts and facts alone, is entitled "School Needs in the Decade Ahead."

For the benefit of my colleagues, I have a number of copies of this book. I shall be glad to make them available to Senators.

Every argument registered on behalf of Federal aid to education is diluted or wiped out by this carefully documented report.

This report was published by the Institute for Social Science Research. It has no ax to grind insofar as I have been able to determine. The author of this book is now a vice president of the Institute; formerly he was with the White House Conference on Education. The facts displayed in this book blow sky high the whole case of the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund and other proponents of vastly greater school expenditures on the Federal level. For example:

Public-school enrollment increased 116 percent from 1900 to 1957. National income increased almost 25 times in this period. But school costs went up 60 times—6,000 percent while enrollment was a little more than doubling.

Nothing that the advocates of far heavier school spending can say will effectively obliterate these facts.

It can be said in another way: Consider population increase, school enrollment gain, and allow for inflation, and this book points out that per capita spending for schools has multiplied 9 times since 1900.

And the share of national income that has gone into schools has multiplied nearly four times.

You can consider a shorter period of time for example. From 1930 to 1956 school expenditures went up 200 percent on the basis of dollars of constant value. Now, while these expenditures were going up 200 percent, enrollment went up only 21.3 percent and the national population increased 36.5 percent.

We can even take as an example the figures for recent years. Between 1952 and 1956 total expenditures by Federal, State, and local government for education increased 48 percent, but expenditures for all other purposes rose only 4 percent.

Far from being starved, it seems to me that facts show that education appears

to be the best provided for function of government, with the possible exception of national defense.

It is, in fact, as the survey says, "in terms of cost—\$14.2 billion in 1956—the largest public service in the United States next to national defense. It roughly equals the sum of the next two largest items of public expenditures."

The increase in the cost of education in the 4 years, 1952–56, equals more than half the increase in all public expenditures, including national defense.

This factual book—and, Mr. President, I obtained several extra copies this morning and would be quite willing to give one of these copies to any Senator who would like to have it—demolishes with facts the claims of those who would turn our educational system over to the whims of a centralized government.

Here is one example dealing with classroom shortage:

Remember Adlai Stevenson's assertion in 1956 that we were almost 500,000 classrooms short and falling behind at the rate of 50,000 a year?

The Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported last fall a shortage of only 140,000 classrooms and all figures point, as this book states, to the fact that most States are constructing classrooms at a current rate which, if maintained over the next 12 years, is adequate.

With respect to the highly publicized story about the shortage of teachers, just what are the facts? New, certified teachers in the public schools in 1956–57 equaled one-half of all college graduates, not one-fifth as some sources have claimed. The statistical record, facts and charts contained in this book, clearly shows that a continuation of the present trend will produce a surplus of teachers.

We now come to the question of sizes of classrooms: Official figures cited in this book show that in 1956 the ratio of teachers to pupils was 1 to 25.6 and steadily decreasing. In 1900, the ratio was 1 to 35.6 pupils and in 1930, it was 1 to 29.2. One of the most illuminating facts that I have discovered deals with the claims that pupils do better in small classes. This report furnishes substantial evidence contained in research studies showing the amazing fact that better than 2 to 1 pupil achievement is higher in large than in small classes.

How does all this compare to the Russian system? We frequently hear these days that Russia is doing better by its youth than the United States. Figures show that in 1956 the United States spent \$103.94 per capita on education. Russia spent \$34.17. I am well aware, Mr. President, that there have been some other studies—particularly one by UNESCO—but these studies valued the Russian ruble at the outrageous, fictitious rate of 25 cents.

Last year, when the first Russian Sputnik went up, this country, in typical fashion, became frantic and looked to the Federal Government for the solution of all our problems, including the loss created in the education system by reason of the family not taking its proper place. At that time we were told that

Sputnik might destroy the United States and the free world. If we are to become so fearful, so frightened, so timid about our own ability to educate our children at the local level, the Russian Sputnik has been far more successful than even the Russians hoped it would be—not in its military possibilities or material possibilities against the free world, but because it is beginning to frighten us—and has already frightened us—into spending more money than we have ever spent in peacetime, much of it on unneeded items, such as the proposal we are discussing tonight which, in its present form, would cost more than \$1 billion.

The Rockefeller report said that this country should "at least double financial support to schools in the next 10 years." This would require, according to the facts contained in this report, either an additional 3 percent sales tax in all States; or, double State and corporate income taxes in all States, or a two-thirds boost in property taxes, or a 20 percent hike in Federal income-tax rates, or the raising of the Federal corporation tax rate from the present 52 percent to 66 percent.

I ask, if legislation were proposed today on this floor to increase Federal income taxes by 20 percent, would not nearly everyone of us, almost to the last man, say that this was fantastic? So what is the solution? This study suggests the dropping of such courses as "marriage and family relationship, child development, grooming, junior homemaking for boys, teenage problems, beauty care, date behavior, consumer buying, stage craft, square dancing, pep club, and fly casting."

I know that this is the worst thing in the world a parent could say, but I agree with the survey, which suggests dropping these courses. As the father of four children, and a taxpayer, I could add to that list, but I wholeheartedly agree with the report.

The report has the audacity to say that our teachers and school facilities could be more effectively used. Again, as a father and a taxpayer, I think we can consider changing the school year from 9 months to 12 months. I think we could still get effective education if we did so. I do not think we need chrome-plated swimming pools or cafeterias in our schools. I think possibly we need a little more reading, writing, and arithmetic, with an occasional whack with a leather strap, if we are to get back to the old days of education.

The report points out that more use can be made of television films and technological methods. Then, "school funds will not need to rise much beyond the growth rate of the national income."

It seems to me that some of those who want to increase education costs inordinately may have been doing some stringent and effective propaganda work.

I believe that is exactly what it is. During the first 2 years of my service in the Senate, I was a member of the Subcommittee on Education, and I heard testimony about the need for Federal aid to education. I did not hear anything then, I have not heard anything since,

to convince me that the Federal Government should put another one of its meddling fingers into the affairs of the States by sticking it into the educational system, a responsibility of the States.

Mr. President, I should like to paraphrase some interesting testimony taken this year. The remarks were made by John M. Stalnaker, president of the National Merit Scholarship Corp., given on March 20, 1958, before the House Committee on Education and Labor. He testified:

"In our country, higher education is widely available, more widely so than in any other country in the world. It is still the responsibility of the individual. We require education through certain age limits, but higher education we look upon as a privilege. We make it available, but the individual must want it, seek it and usually spend some money to get it. Scholarship programs are frequently intended to remedy the loss of talent, to encourage and make it possible for able students to go to college." S. 4237 proposed has this as a purpose. Here we can consider some facts.

1. According to the Office of Education over one-half of our high school graduates are continuing their education and almost all of the most brilliant students are going to college.

"If we select, State by State, prorated by population, the best 10,000 students by the usual techniques, how many are not already college bound?"

Dr. Stalnaker further stated that in the national merit scholarship program last year some 15,000 students were identified. Samples were checked since that time to determine how many of these students were not in college. It was found:

Of the top 7,500 students, drawn from each State in proportion to population (just as both bills propose) we find about 97 percent in college. Of the next 7,500, about 95 percent are in college.

He said:

Thus without a Federal scholarship program, more of these students are going to college—well over 90 percent. Of those not going, only a fraction can be hoped to be changed by a Federal scholarship program.

Dr. Stalnaker then made the point that the type of legislation we are considering here proposes scholarship help. What is the purpose of the Federal scholarship program? Is it to make a college education available for able youth who could not otherwise attend college? If so, then it will fail for it will have, I predict, as a main effect, the concentration of able students in a relatively few of our more expensive colleges and making it possible for high-tuition colleges to raise their tuitions higher. It will discourage State and private scholarship programs and sharply decrease private efforts. When the Federal Government takes over, private sources yield.

Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, of the University of Chicago, using figures from a study by the Educational Testing Service, estimated that three-fourths of the males and three-fifths of the females in the upper quartile of ability of last year's high-school graduates entered college. He further estimated that those able to go who did not go to college failed to

do so either because of lack of motivation or because—for boys, they preferred to enter some trade or vocation or the armed service; or for girls, they preferred early marriage.

Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this discussion. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a statement prepared by the American Farm Bureau Federation, bringing out some of the facts to which I have already alluded, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY ON FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION BY THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, PRESENTED BY JOHN C. LYNN, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, APRIL 2, 1958, BEFORE THE HOUSE GENERAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The 1958 policy of the American Farm Bureau Federation on general education, adopted by the voting delegates of the member State farm bureaus, is as follows:

"We maintain that the control, administration, and financing of our public school system must remain identified with the smallest unit of government capable of satisfactory performance.

"We oppose expanded Federal aid to education. Adequate Federal assistance for school districts experiencing severe financial burdens resulting from Federal projects should be on a grant-in-aid basis. * * *

The advent of the sputnik age has focused new attention on the status of our public school system. A number of people have cited many weaknesses and many cures. One of the cures advocated is a new and expanded program of Federal aid to general education. These schemes include many things but mainly are directed toward Federal grants, aids, and scholarships. * * *

Is there a need for a program of Federal scholarships, both at the undergraduate and graduate level? We do not believe there is. * * *

The spectacular increase in our college and university enrollment has justifiedly been called a revolution in American education.

A few figures may illustrate what has happened:

Resident college and university enrollment in the United States

1899-1900-----	237,592
1920-30-----	1,100,737
1957-58-----	3,450,000

Source: 1899-1900 and 1929-30: U. S. Office of Education, Statistics of Higher Education, 1953-54, p. 7. 1957-58: U. S. Office of Education, release, Aug. 17, 1957.

Enrollment in higher education has doubled almost four times since the turn of the century; while the population of the United States has slightly more than doubled.

The college-age group (18-21 years) increased 51 percent between 1900 and 1957 (5.9 to 8.9 million).

Enrollment in colleges, as shown above, increased 1,352 percent (multiplied 14½ times).

A comparison between the years 1930 and 1957 may spotlight the dramatic change that has taken place:

The population of the United States increased 48 million: equals +39 percent (123.1 million to 171.2 million).

The college-age group (18-21 years) decreased 100,000: equals -1 percent (9.0 million to 8.9 million).

Enrollment in colleges and universities increased 2.3 million: equals +214 percent (1.1 million to 3.4 million).

In 1900 about 4 out of 100 young people went to college, in 1930 12 did; enrollment in 1957-58 equals 39 percent of the 18 to 21-year age group. Some of the college students are older than 21. It may be estimated that about one-third of our young people now enter college. Two-thirds of those entering continue until graduation.

What about the shortage of engineers cited so frequently?

In a special report *Engineers: Too Many or Too Few?* U. S. News & World Report (January 10, 1958), stated that in talking with leaders of engineering societies, with faculty members of engineering colleges, with industry leaders, and with Government officials there appears "general agreement on this: There is no real shortage of engineers overall. There may be shortages of some specific types of engineers."

The United States Office of Education recently announced (circular 515, December 1957) that engineering enrollment in institutions of higher learning has increased from 165,637 in fall 1951 to 297,077 in fall 1957, an increase of 79 percent in the span of 6 years. At that rate of increase—are we likely to be short of engineers 4 years from now?

At present there is no general shortage of engineers or scientists. While creative and research talent is always in short supply, there is ample evidence that our technically trained manpower supply, if properly and fully utilized, is adequate for both our economic and military needs.

The real question is how we utilize the engineering and scientific talent we have available, not how quickly we develop such talent.

These various programs for expanded Federal aid to general education are indicated to be temporary. Nothing is so permanent as a temporary Federal program. How you would end a program of Federal aid after 4 or 6 years is rather difficult to conceive. We believe the proposals being suggested could eventually lead to a far broader program of Federal aid to education, including such things as Federal aid for teachers' salaries.

A program of expanded Federal aid to general education could certainly involve Federal intervention and control in the operation of our public educational system. Farmers recognize the dangers of too much dependence on the Federal Government. Government aid means Government controls.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, according to a study just released by the College Placement Council July 1958, there was a 4-percent increase this year over last year in engineering graduates. While 93 percent of these graduates of last spring have been placed, according to this study, there has been little or no recruiting scramble to get this spring's graduates.

In a study just completed for the Institute for Social Science Research, a well-documented evaluation of conditions in American schools and the financing of public education was provided.

In summarizing the conclusions of this year-long study, the author, Roger A. Freeman, from whose book I have already quoted, states:

The emerging picture is clear-cut and unequivocal; the American people have loyally and faithfully supported their schools. The record of steeply increasing school revenues is nothing short of spectacular and makes no case for holding revenue funds responsible for any shortcomings in the product of your public school system.

In documenting the various aspects of school progress in school finance in this

country, Mr. Freeman indicates how widely enrollment increases have varied. I might note here that the study reveals that the greatest enrollment increases are occurring most often in those States most able to take care of them. In this category, I include my own State of Arizona where, I am glad to note from the study, expenditures per pupil have more than kept up with enrollment figures. The salaries of teachers have risen slightly faster than the national average in spite of our tremendous enrollment increase, although I am pleased to note also from this study, our extensive classroom construction has been done at classroom costs well below the estimate which the Office of Education made in providing entitlement under Public Law 815.

Mr. President, this new study which the Institute for Social Science Research has done clearly indicates that our American public-school system is better supported than the school systems in any other country and keeps more children in school for more years.

The visual analysis provided in this study, summarized, shows not only that teacher and classroom shortages in our schools have been greatly exaggerated and are rapidly diminishing, but—

1. That the pupil-teacher ratio has been declining constantly even during the recent years of enrollment increases.

2. That, over the past decade, the percentage of college graduates who go into teaching has risen sharply, and the number of certificated teachers in the public schools has increased faster than the labor force.

3. That the number of bachelor and professional degrees in the teacher force has grown consistently.

4. That more persons are leaving non-school jobs than quit teaching to accept private employment.

5. That the teacher cost, of higher costs in education, result from the following factors:

- (a) A decline in the productivity of teachers.

- (b) A proliferation of course offerings and the assumption of noneducational responsibilities by the schools (which the study found to be responsible for the employment of 100,000 additional teachers).

- (c) The change from the subject-centered schools to the child-centered or activity schools, which has caused, among other things, building space required per pupil to increase from 50 to 100 percent during the past 20 or 30 years.

Recognizing that enrollments will and should increase in our schools, this study reveals that State and local school systems are equal to this spending task. Although school expenditures will more than double by 1970, this is requiring States and the communities to utilize more fully all the tax sources available to them.

Two weeks ago, Gov. Harold W. Hanley, Governor of Indiana, wrote to me sending some interesting material. He told me that following the launching of Sputnik I, Indiana began a thorough factfinding study of its educational system, with particular emphasis on science and mathematics courses, enrollments and pupil aptitudes. Every ninth grade student received an identical test and the results were evaluated by professional laboratories. The exceptional in-

dividuals were then asked how many wished to enter college and how many would need financial and scholarship assistance. This is the first State I know of to do this—and the results are most illuminating.

THE NEED FOR SCHOLARSHIPS FOR TALENTED PUPILS

A questionnaire was sent to the 707 high school principals in Indiana asking the following question:

How many students in your school qualify by the way of interest, ability, and aptitude in science and mathematics to perform successful college work; how many do you estimate are unable to attend college because of lack of financial resources?

The replies to this question indicated that there were approximately 2,000 students who had the interest, ability, and aptitude for science and mathematics but lacked the funds needed for higher education.

A 4½-hour comprehensive examination in science, mathematics, English, and social studies was given to all seniors wanting to take the examination. Of the estimated 2,000 qualified pupils who needed aid as reported on the questionnaires, 703 of these pupils took this comprehensive examination and the results were machine scored. There were 199 of the 703 pupils who ranked above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science based on national norms. The 199 pupils were then divided into four categories:

First. Twenty-seven pupils were counted in group I that included all pupils making above the 90 percentile based on national norms in each of the four fields of mathematics, science, English and social studies.

Second. Seventy-three pupils were counted in group II that included all pupils making above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science, and a percentile average of above 90 in the four areas tested.

Third. Ninety-nine pupils were counted in group III that included all pupils ranking above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science but making a percentile rating of 90 or lower in English and social studies.

The committee decided to consider at this time any of those pupils in group III for scholarship aid who had a percentile ranking of 95 or above in mathematics and science. This consideration included 179 of the 199 students. These students were asked concerning their ability to finance their higher education. Twenty-three students did not reply and it was assumed they had financial resources for attending college. Fourteen students stated that they had sufficient to attend a college or university of their own choice for 1 year. Twenty-five students advised the committee that they were going into fields other than mathematics and science in higher education therefore automatically eliminating themselves.

A need formula was applied to the 117 remaining and qualified pupils. This formula has been widely used throughout the United States to determine, first, the financial need necessary and, second, the amount of financial aid required in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

Sixty-four students were eliminated by the formula, leaving 53 qualifying for aid. Of the 53 qualifying for financial aid, 37 already had scholarships ranging from \$25 to \$750.

The committee learned that the problem at hand was not to provide scholarships as only 16 were needed and could be taken care of. The problem is providing financial assistance for those already having scholarships in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

A plan is being devised by the State whereby the 53 needing financial aid in order to complete 1 year of college education may secure that aid providing, of course, they enroll in college this fall and make satisfactory grades.

I now come to the constitutional argument, and I refer to the testimony of Dr. Cyrus W. Anderson, filed April 2, 1958, with the Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee.

Federal aid for schools, for any purpose, is morally and legally wrong because it will lead to Federal control. A 1942 decision of the Supreme Court reads as follows:

It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes (317 U. S., p. 131, decision by Justice Jackson in case of *Wickard v. Filburn*, 1942).

Public education is a matter that should be controlled by the States and localities and not by the Central Government. This is clearly defined in the 10th amendment to the Constitution:

Powers reserved to States: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Nothing could be more clearly worded. The 10th amendment prohibits Congress from interfering in the business of the States, and this certainly would include the public schools. Nowhere in the Constitution is Congress given permission to tax and spend for the Nation's schools.

Our constitutional form of government is endangered by the continuing advance of Federal powers and the usurpation of State and local responsibilities.

If Federal aid to education is imposed, it eventually will achieve the breakdown of constitutional government, remove educational responsibility from parents—where it belongs—and make collectivized captives of our children.

A resolution at the national convention September 16–19, 1957, of the American Legion states:

Federal aid to education could result in loss of local control and the imposition of propagandized national education such as was experienced in Nazi Germany and now exists in Soviet Russia.

Under the 10th amendment, education is clearly a matter of State jurisdiction. Local boards of education are an integral part of State government; as representatives of that government they govern and conduct our school systems on a purely local basis. They consider the views of the parents and citizens whose children will be affected by decisions that they make. They do not take their orders from Washington. This will all be changed under S. 4237. Although S.

4237 attempts to enunciate a policy which would deprive the Federal Government of the right to control the State education systems, we need only to look at what happened in the vocational educational program to find out what will most surely happen here.

In 1916, Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act, which provided financial aid for local vocational educational systems. Prior to passage, the same arguments were advanced by those for it. They proclaimed that safeguards were such that Federal control could never follow; State educators predicted otherwise. Today, in a 108-page book entitled "Administration of Vocational Education," these regulations are voluminously set forth.

In at least five places, S. 4237 requires that the individual States involved must submit State plans which meet the requirements of the Commissioner of Education of the Federal Government. This is true of the scholarship, the loan, the foreign language and equipment subsidies and on guidance and counseling, and an additional State plan must be submitted on the area vocational educational program.

From what has happened in a closely related field, we certainly should be able to see that it will be but a very short time until we have substituted the judgment of Federal bureaucrats for that of our own local citizens who have been largely responsible for the growth of our school systems, causing a 1,352 percent increase in college enrollment from 1900 to 1957.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in the past 25 years Congress, the administrative branch, and the judicial branch have done enough harm to what I consider the keystone of our Constitution—the 10th amendment. I do not like to be a party to what is likely to happen tonight by taking away another of the powers given to the States and never delegated by the States to the Federal Government.

If we continue the trend toward the welfare state, the trend toward centralized government, then some of us—yes, many of us—may be alive to say, "Yes; I was there when that started, and I am sorry I had a part in it."

We have traveled too far down the path of centralized government and the welfare state. We have said too long to the American people, "You cannot do this yourself. Let the people who work on the banks of the Potomac do it."

We have poured in more and more people and more and more billions of dollars to let the people who work on the banks of the Potomac do for the American people those things which the Americans better do for themselves.

To me, this involves not only the question whether we shall continue to do damage to our Constitution, but also whether we shall continue to damage the morale of the people. We need only to read history. We need only to read the histories of the great civilizations and the great governments which have declined and sunk into the morass of low morale to realize what we are coming to.

Anyone who can read the English language and can understand it can determine for himself what we are doing tonight, as we have done for the past 25 years, is to follow exactly in the path of Babylon, in the path of Egypt, and in the path of Rome. Let us read and reread what Gibbon said on the subject of the fall of Rome. First, there was an increase in divorce and the breaking up of family homes. He continued by listing the dependence of the people on the government, followed by the centralizing of the government in the Roman senate. I think what Gibbon said should be reread by every American tonight and tomorrow, so that we can become a little frightened by what Congress and the executive branch are doing. We are putting a Federal crutch under the arms of the people. We are taking away the bootstraps which Americans once grasped firmly and pulled on to make something out of themselves. We are instilling in the American people the desire to rely upon the Federal Government for everything they need and do.

No; I will not be a part of such activity. I do not want to tell my children and grandchildren that I destroyed one more bulwark of our Constitution; that I kicked one more brick from the structure of that great document.

I am a little sick and tired of hearing both political parties in the United States say to the people, "Look to Washington," forgetting that what our forefathers said: "Look to God; look to our flag; Look to ourselves—we can do the job."

If the Federal Government continues to say to the States, "We will build your schools; we will educate your children," how long will it be until the American people will be told, "All is gone. We are a socialized state. Ours is a centralized government?"

We have gone completely around the circle. We have come back to the exact situation which caused our forefathers to leave Europe more than 300 years ago. We have returned to centralized government. We have said to the people of our country, "You have no dignity. The only dignity is in the Federal Government." We have said to Americans, "You have no freedom."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the acting minority leader yield an additional 4 minutes to me from the time on the bill?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield 4 minutes more to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in my opinion, we are engaged tonight in the destruction of our constitutional freedom. I have kept quiet long enough about these dangers. I am not very proud of the Republican Party tonight, as I realize it has joined in the chorus started by the Democrats: "Let us federalize the schools." I know that the amount provided is not large. It is proposed to grant a few scholarships. But we are going to throw another billion dollars down the drain for something which has never been proved to be needed. As I said in my minority views,

once the camel gets his nose under the tent, the body will follow. As surely as I am standing on the floor of the Senate, if the McNamara amendment is not successful tonight, within the course of 1 year there will be before Congress a bill providing for the construction of schools. I prophesy that in the following Congress bills will be introduced to control education and the schools. That frightens me. Mr. President, I am more frightened about what is going on within the country than I am frightened about what the Russians can do to us. I fear that the action we are taking tonight and the action we have taken thus far this year to create a \$12 billion fiscal deficit will come closer to doing what Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, and Communists have said they would do, namely, destroy the American people without fighting us, by destroying our economy, than anything they can do to us materially with bombs, missiles, and aircraft.

If the morale of the American people is destroyed, if the initiative of our young people is destroyed, if the pride and initiative and responsibility of their parents in connection with the education of their children is destroyed, Mr. President, you and I will live to see the day when the American way of life will be no more. I know that the present distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. THURMOND] feels about this matter as I do, and does not want or seek to have the American way of life destroyed any more than I do.

Mr. President, in reading the hearings of the committee on this bill I notice that—as is customary—only excerpts of the testimony of witnesses have been set forth. That is in accordance with the experience which the distinguished occupant of the Chair and I have had.

At this time I read from the testimony presented to the committee by one of the very distinguished educators of the Nation, Dr. Detlev Bronk, president of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council:

A second topic to which you have asked me to speak is this: The deficiencies in American education as related to national defense.

This I would say: There is an inadequate number of competent teachers, and there are inadequate opportunities for the continued development of those we have. There is an inadequate local sense of responsibility, and this I would strongly stress for the reason that education is a personal matter.

Later in the hearings, I asked some questions on this subject. I now read from that point of the hearings:

Senator GOLDWATER. Dr. Bronk, I want to join my colleagues in their comments on your presentation. I personally think it is the best I have heard on the subject.

I have just 1 or 2 questions on this subject, and they are rather basic. I was very happy to hear you explain your position on the Federal approach to education. It seems today, when we reach a problem, we are all afraid to face up to it, and our first reaction is, look to the Federal Government for a solution.

LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS

What is wrong with our educational system today? Am I wrong in assuming that we must start at the local school board level and find the answers?

Dr. BRONK. I certainly do not think you are wrong, sir.

Mr. President, cannot the Congress and the executive branch of the Government just once in a generation say to the young people, the middle aged people, and the older people of the Nation, "America got along pretty well without having the Federal Government meddle in the affairs of its citizens, without putting a Federal crutch under every problem, and we are going to see what we can do to have the Nation return to the status of individual strength."

Mr. President, insofar as primary and secondary education are concerned I have greater confidence in the local school board of the community in which I live, and, insofar as higher education is concerned, I have greater confidence in the State universities and colleges and their ability to care for the education of my children, than I have in any presidential appointee whose nomination would be confirmed by the Senate, who would be surrounded by thousands and thousands of bureaucrats, and would be provided with billions upon billions of dollars with which to do the same job.

Mr. President, I intend to vote against the bill. The pending bill can be dressed up in any kind of skin one might wish, but it is still baloney. It is still dangerous to the Nation.

The best thing I can do for my community, my State, and my country, affecting the education of my children and the children of all the other citizens of the United States, is to see to it that Federal aid to education receives a decided setback; and I hope that will be done by the Senate tonight.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time required therefor charged to the time available to either side, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment which has been submitted by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] to provide Federal aid to States for school construction. In fact, I am a cosponsor of the amendment, along with several other Senators, and I am very glad to be.

Education is the most important problem which confronts the Nation today.

In October 1957, shortly after the Soviets sent their sputnik into space, a distinguished educator, Prof. John L. Dunning, of Columbia University, said that the United States must meet the challenge of the Soviet Union in "this age of technological imperialism" if our strength and progress are to be maintained.

He said:

While the Soviets have already gained their exploitation of this new and awesome age, we have not, because our people, our Government, and our schools, have not yet grasped its full significance.

Mr. President, education is important today not solely because of an emergency in national defense. I believe that, belatedly, we have come to recognize that educational advancement is necessary for our economic growth and for our full intellectual and cultural development, if our country is to fulfill its promise.

In large measure, the challenge must be met by action taken by State local and private school bodies.

Our educational system should have higher standards in curriculums, higher requirements of scholarship, for students, better teachers, and more classrooms.

I support Senate bill 4237. However, the bill can do nothing more, in my opinion, than meet emergency needs.

The pending bill, S. 4237, is designed to select the best students now available—whether in high school or college—for advanced undergraduate and graduate training.

It has been argued today, in opposition to the bill, that the scholarships and fellowships to be made available under the provisions of the bill, will be used for the pursuit of frivolous studies. I firmly believe that it is clear that the intention of the bill is to have the scholarships and fellowships awarded to students because of their superior qualifications, and their serious purpose to study in the fields of science, engineering, languages, and also to study the humanities, basic and prior to all knowledge.

Mr. President, in our deliberations in the committee, we did not limit the scope of the bill to scholarships for science and engineering. We should realize that there must be a return to the study of the humanities if there is to be any advancement in knowledge.

Nevertheless, I believe we must face the fact that the deficiencies of our educational system cannot be met without Federal aid. So if the issue is to be joined on Federal aid, let it be joined on the amendment.

One need is that of classrooms. This need would be met in part by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], which I support. The problem of classroom shortages is not new. We all know that the shortage has not blossomed overnight. We have known for a long time that not enough schools were built during World War II and the Korean war, because of shortages both of manpower and of materials. But we have done little about it.

This fall the opening elementary and secondary school enrollment is estimated to be approximately 33 million students. By 1960 it will be 40 million. It is estimated the 1965 enrollment will swell to 44 million.

Moreover, according to the United States Office of Education, there are today almost 2 million pupils in classrooms in excess of the normal capacity of the classrooms.

Today, according to the Office of Education, the Nation needs 140,000 additional classrooms. One-half are needed merely to take care of the overflow of students, and the other half are needed to replace classrooms no longer fit for children to use.

This crisis is a real one. Former Secretary Marion B. Folsom said that from 59,000 to 65,000 additional classrooms are needed each year simply to keep up with each year's enrollment increases and replacement needs.

The States estimated that they would build about 70,000 classrooms in 1956-57. Actually, in the last year 68,600 were completed. Even if the States had reached their objective, Mr. Folsom points out, the States "would reduce the shortage by only from 4,000 to 10,000 classrooms a year. At this rate, a minimum of 16 years would be required to eliminate the total shortage. The maximum would run all the way to 40 years."

The amendment of the Senator from Michigan would provide a program of Federal grants to the States of \$1 billion a year for 2 years, to be divided among the States in the ratio the school population of each State bears to the total school population.

This amendment will provide Federal aid, but it would leave the responsibility to the States.

It is proper that the States and local communities should make the greatest effort; but, even using all the States' resources, the need for classrooms cannot be met. Today more than half, indeed almost two-thirds, of the money used to operate our schools comes from local resources. Local funds, as we all know, rely heavily on property taxes, and property taxes are as high in most States as is possible. There must be some equalization between the States if equality of educational opportunity is to be available for every boy and girl.

Further delay will only increase the seriousness of the alarming classroom shortage. The problem has reached floodtide proportions, and State and local efforts cannot help much longer. It is apparent that only a federally aided program of school construction can meet the need.

A few minutes ago—and I say this with all deference to my friend, the Senator from Arizona, who is not present at the moment—it was said this was a Democratic program. I should like to say that in 1947, when I was for the first time a Member of the Senate, I joined with other Members, under the leadership of a Republican, the late Senator Taft of Ohio, Senator Tobey of New Hampshire, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], all Republicans, as well as Senator Thomas of Utah, in introducing a Fed-

eral-aid bill for our schools. Senator Taft was chief sponsor of that bill, and the bill passed the Senate.

I know that we have become accustomed to quoting Senator Taft on many issues. Perhaps it is not wholly fair to do so, but I should like to read what he said in a speech on the Senate floor on the question of Federal aid to education. The speech was made on March 24, 1948. Senator Taft said:

Four years ago, I opposed the bill on this subject; but in the course of that debate it became so apparent that many children in the United States were left without education, and then it became apparent upon further study, that that was not the fault, necessarily, of the States where they lived, but rather the financial abilities of the States, that I could see no way of meeting the condition which now exists regarding illiteracy in the United States and lack of education in the United States without some Federal assistance, particularly for those States which today are considerably below the average wealth of the United States.

He said further:

It is popular to provide for public works. * * * Public works are nice things; we can see them. But when it comes down to the basic necessities of life and the basic elements of human welfare and human progress, there is nothing more important than education. It does not have the glamour that other things have, but it seems to me we must go forward in the field of education for our people and I know of no way of going forward in that field to any substantial degree without providing some Federal financial assistance.

Finally he said:

I do not think I can exaggerate the necessity of education. Primary education lies at the basis of all forms of republican government. A government depending on the making of decisions by the people and depending on their intelligence can exist only if the people have some ability to understand the problems of government which are presented to them. Unless there is a satisfactory educational basis, there cannot possibly be hope for success in any democratic form of government where the people are expected to rule and to decide the questions which are placed before them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President; classroom deficiency is not the only deficiency in our educational system. As I began my remarks, I said the need of higher standards in curricula in elementary and secondary schools is one of our basic needs. However, that is a matter for local and private educational bodies. I do not know what the Congress can do about it. I hope that the President of the United States may appoint a small commission, made up of outstanding scholars, not to study again the deficiencies of our educational system, but to consult with governors and with heads of State educational bodies, in the at-

tempt to impress upon them the importance of raising the standards of curricula in elementary and secondary schools, and the requirements of scholarships for students.

But the Senate is dealing now with an amendment which would go to one issue, that of Federal aid to provide needed classrooms for the schools of the Nation. I hope very much the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the able Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the proponents of general Federal aid to education have chosen the flag of national defense under which to sail their ship of general Federal aid to education across the Congress and the country. S. 4237 is, in my opinion, not sufficiently adapted to defense needs to be considered a defense bill. I seriously doubt that it will improve our relative position in the fields of science and technology.

This bill contains a variety of programs, and by this variety, apparently attempts to adopt as many of the suggestions offered as is possible, and more by far than is practical.

It contains a scholarship program for college work.

It also contains a student loan program.

In addition to the scholarship program and the student loan program, there is provided a program of national defense fellowships, which is one-half grant, one-half loan.

There are grants for equipment and facilities for the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in primary and secondary schools.

There are institutes for school teachers and counselors.

There is also a separate type of institute for teachers of foreign languages.

The bill provides for Federal participation in the establishment of a counseling program.

It also provides for research and experimentation in teaching by radio, television, and motion picture.

The vocational program has not been forgotten, an additional program hav-

ing been added with an authorization of a \$20 million annual appropriation.

A science information center has been thrown in, too, this latter being in effect a national library of science.

It must be admitted that almost no branch in the field of education has been overlooked for Federal participation by this bill. Obviously, the proponents of this measure have adopted a shotgun approach.

Despite the inclusion in this bill of so many types of programs, and such a variety of approaches, I repeat that this bill will not appreciably contribute to the national defense. Neither the scholarship program nor the student loan program is limited in any way to persons undertaking a course of study considered to be critical to our national defense. Under one of these programs, a participating student might study social welfare work, domestic science, or for that matter, flower arranging. Only those programs designed for the advancement of modern foreign languages are limited to any extent so far as curriculum is concerned.

Even were strict curriculum requirements imposed on these programs, a major deficiency from a national defense standpoint would still exist. In the student loan and fellowship programs, it has been provided that a recipient can repay the loan by serving in the teaching profession. In no other program in this bill is there any requirement that the participant serve in any capacity in the field which the Government has assisted in his training. As far as the language of the bill is concerned, a person, by participating in the scholarship program and the national defense fellowship, might, with financing from the Federal Government, obtain his doctorate in nuclear physics, and upon his graduation enter upon employment with a stock brokerage firm, and never thereafter utilize, in the national defense interest, one iota of his taxpayer-financed scientific training.

For these reasons, the bill under consideration is sadly lacking in provisions which would make it effective from a national defense standpoint.

No State or local study reveals that needs cannot be met at the State and local levels. Federal intervention, in fact, is neither needed nor desired.

How does the administration justify its proposal for intervention in science education, guidance, and scholarships in view of these studies and the findings of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, second report, 1958:

The Committee recommends that private, local, and State sources increase their support of scholarship funds to several times the present amount and number of scholarships. The Committee believes that, insofar as assistance by the Federal Government is concerned, it should not at the present time, in the light of the considerations presented earlier in this chapter, undertake to provide new scholarships (other than work-study) for undergraduate students.

There is no evidence that the American people, State or local school boards or educators in general want the Federal Government to supervise or stand-

ardize education in the United States in the fields of science, guidance or scholarships.

Governors of various States have made statements opposing Federal intervention in education. Among these Governors are: Gov. Price Daniel, of Texas; Gov. William G. Stratton, of Illinois; Gov. James P. Coleman, of Mississippi; Gov. Milward L. Simpson, of Wyoming; Gov. George Bell Timmerman, of South Carolina; Gov. Albert Chandler, of Kentucky; Gov. James E. Folsom, of Alabama.

Gov. Harold W. Handley, of Indiana, wrote on July 22, 1958:

Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions, and institutions now independent or State-supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington, which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually.

Less than 2 weeks ago, Gov. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., on August 4, 1958, in opposing H. R. 13247, said:

Education, historically and legally, is the obligation of the States and their localities and there is no emergency or any other circumstance which would justify the surrender of this responsibility to the Federal Government.

I, therefore, strongly oppose H. R. 13247, which would inject the Federal Government in a new field of Federal aid to education. The Commonwealth of Virginia is instituting a new program of scholarship and loan aid to promising students and for many years has encouraged other scholarship arrangements for the benefit of young men and women of promise, who required assistance beyond their own means in completing their education.

There is no demonstrated need for the proposed Federal scholarships and as has been true in so many other Federal aid programs, this proposal undoubtedly would constitute the beginning of permanent additional expense and burden upon the taxpayers of the country. There is no field or activity which is more important to be retained under local control than education, and I view this suggested legislation as an entering wedge to destroy such control.

I am not ready to concede that there is sufficient justification for the Federal Government to enter into the field of education. If such justification exists, however, Federal participation should be limited to that area best designed to meet the needs of national defense. It would be much better, if national defense requires Federal aid to education, to concentrate on a tremendous student loan program, whereby the opportunity for training would be made more readily available to those who have initiative and talent. Even such a loan program should be limited to students pursuing courses of study in science, mathematics, foreign languages, and other such courses closely and directly related to the national defense. The bill should spell out requirements for participants to utilize their training at least for some minimum period in the national defense interest.

Furthermore, there is, generally speaking, no requirement that the Federal program of student assistance be limited to those persons who actually need help in order to obtain advanced education. The lack of this limitation can only result in a duplication of non-Federal student assistance programs and in assistance to those financially able to pay for their own education.

Except in those fields related directly to the national defense, the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to invade the field of education. Nowhere in the Constitution is the word "education" or any synonym thereof used. The framers of the Constitution wisely recognized that education is a responsibility of the State, the community and the parents. The Constitution declares in the 10th amendment:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

This clearly places education in the realm of State responsibility.

I realize that there are Members of this body, Members of the other House, and those among the general public who would place expediency before adherence to the Constitution. These groups take the position that the Federal Government must move into the field of education since the State and local communities are unable to perform the job adequately. No argument could be more fallacious.

There can be no doubt that the Federal Government, necessitated by spendthrift Congresses such as this, has usurped an overwhelming majority of the tax sources, thereby severely limiting the ability of the States and local communities to provide for those needs which lie within the realm of their responsibilities. This area, in itself, is one to which those concerned with inadequacies of State and local finances might concern themselves. Nevertheless, the individual States and local communities are almost without exception in a more sound and healthier economic condition than the Federal Government. It is astonishing to me, that we could contemplate a national debt of \$280 billion, which must surely go higher, and at the same time point to financial inability on the part of a State or local community. Such a viewpoint is absurd.

While considering relative economic abilities, it should not be overlooked that the Federal Government returns less value per dollar of tax money received than does the State government, just as the State government returns less value per tax dollar received than does the municipal government. In other words, the farther the dollar goes from home, the less value is returned. The tax dollar can be compared to the corn which is taken to the miller for conversion into meal. In each tax dollar we should not forget that the miller also has a toll chute, and the largest toll chute of all is that of the Federal Government.

Another factor so often overlooked or disregarded by the proponents of Federal spending is the fact that regardless of which level of government provides

the service, it is the same individual taxpayers who must foot the bill. The Federal Government comes no closer to being a Santa Claus than does any other government.

The total cost of this bill over a 4-year period is estimated to be between one and one and a half billion dollars. This is exclusive of \$220 million in student loans; \$10 million in loans for science equipment and facilities; and an undetermined amount of loans in the fellowship program. It is obvious that this bill proposes for the Federal Government to continue its practice of exercising leadership with money rather than with ideas.

I realize most fully that there are deficiencies in our national approach to education. I further realize that these deficiencies reflect on the national defense. They concern me most deeply. Unlike the proponents of this bill, however, I am far from convinced that money alone, whether from the Federal, State, or local level, will provide a solution for these deficiencies. This is amply illustrated by the fact that any person of ability, who has a fair degree of ambition and initiative, can today, without Government assistance, obtain the best formal education available in this country. There are innumerable types of financial assistance available to the person with ambition and initiative. For instance, in my own State of South Carolina, there are 88 separate sources of scholarships of which I am aware. Of these, there are 29 colleges which offer scholarships, 7 governmental agencies, 21 business and industrial firms, and 31 civic and fraternal organizations and professional groups. In addition, there are 79 separate sources from which students may obtain educational loans. In addition to scholarship and loan funds which are available, almost every college in my State has available part-time job opportunities for deserving students. I am sure that South Carolina is not unduly exceptional in this regard.

There appear to be two major deficiencies in our educational process, neither of which can be readily or directly improved by the mere expenditure of funds.

The first deficiency is a nebulous one, characterized by an existing state of mind in an overwhelming number of the parents, teachers, and of general public throughout our land. It is the complete mental inertia which inevitably results from the destruction of the natural rewards of industry and initiative. This country was founded upon a system of free enterprise. So long as free enterprise was nurtured and encouraged and not unduly limited by a monstrous Federal Government, our country prospered. It prospered because a man could gain in return for his industry and initiative the respect of his fellow man, as well as financial independence. This philosophy of free enterprise, which was and is the backbone of this country, is being replaced by an assumption that the Federal Government can be all things to all men, which is another way of expressing the

underlying philosophy of the welfare State.

If we would encourage from our people an upsurge of initiative, industry, and inventiveness, we must bring a halt to the welfare legislation and programs which invariably encourage indolence in any people subjected to their insatiable influence. The pending bill, with its generous grants and stipends, including travel and dependency allowances, fairly begs an indolent student attitude.

The second major deficiency of our modern educational process lies in the application of what is erroneously called "progressive" education. Actually, this deficiency is inclusive of a number of erroneous concepts which are now being widely applied to the harm of unsuspecting students and the general population of the country.

The most insidious of these concepts is that which assumes that since all men are created equal, they, therefore, have equal and identical ability. I have heard it advanced as an adjunct to this philosophy that environment alone determines the net resulting product in individual attitude and mentality. We must first recognize that we can—and at the State and local level—provide equality of opportunity for formal education. We cannot, however, provide or guarantee an equality of ability or knowledge through education; for the Creator, in His great wisdom, made no two men alike, either physically or mentally. We must, therefore, return to a recognition of individuality in the application of the educational process, rather than attempting to use a common mold for all students.

Another fallacious and destructive practice identified with progressive education is that of stressing methodology at the expense of substance. This, and not the lack of funds, is, in my opinion, primarily responsible for the lack of capable teachers and professional educators. I do not believe it is possible for any person, regardless of how well versed in methods of teaching, to ignite in a student the spark of interest which is vital to true education, unless that person has an intimate knowledge of, and interest in, the substantive subject matter he seeks to teach.

This is one instance in which we might profit from the best in the European educational system. The testimony of Dr. Wernher von Braun is to me most persuasive. Dr. von Braun, testifying before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, said:

Furthermore, I would say that in teachers' training, European schools and universities care very little about methodology, about how people teach. They say if this man is a good mathematician or a good physicist, and if he is really fired up by a message he has to give to his pupils, then you need not train him in how to teach, and what techniques and little tricks to use, because he will do a good job anyway. On the other hand, if there is no fire burning in the man, then he is a poor teacher to begin with, and with no amount of methodology training can you make a good one out of him. So you might as well eliminate him right away.

Progressive education ignores the fact that it is primarily the obligation of the family, the church, and the community to teach, by example and advocacy, the art of human relations. It is the duty of the educator to train the minds of the students in order that they may reason to a sound and logical conclusion by the recognition and assimilation of factual knowledge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Dr. von Braun was most persuasive on this point also, and I again quote from his testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee:

With regard to elementary schools, and to some extent also to colleges, there is the question of emphasis on human relations and similar things versus emphasis on just plain intellectual training.

I do not remember that I ever attended any classes in Europe on family life or human relations, or subjects like boy-girl relations at college. We just learned reading, writing, and arithmetic in the lower schools. Later on they taught us technical and scientific subjects, but nothing else.

This whole area of social adjustment of life, which plays such an important role in American education, is given very little attention in Europe.

Discipline is the castoff of progressive education. No amount of money can make up for the failure to teach discipline which must be applied from without in formative years in order that it may be applied from within in mature years.

Progressive education cannot be eliminated by Federal funds. Its elimination can be accomplished only through a reevaluation of our educational purposes and a return to sound principles and courses of instruction. A national leadership, not with money, but in ideas, would be most helpful in this regard. Such leadership, by stressing the parental, local, and State shortcomings and responsibilities, through a constructive and cooperative approach, can do much toward obtaining a reassertion of parental concern and action toward revitalizing the American school system. It is a national problem, but one that is soluble at the local level only.

I reiterate that S. 4237 is not designed to overcome national defense deficiencies in the field of education, which is the only basis upon which a Federal education program could be constitutionally undertaken. There are neither curriculum limitations nor requirements for proper utilization of training for national defense after completion of federally financed education.

Even were the deficiencies of education correctable by the expenditure of funds, the Federal Government is the least economically sound unit to undertake this program; and, in addition, the Federal Government is the most expensive and wasteful of any unit through which the taxpayer's dollar is applied.

If this bill were enacted, with its grants and stipends, more harm by far

would be done through the destruction of individual initiative, than good accomplished from the additional opportunities provided, even though these programs did not overlap existing financial assistance programs, which they do. The real deficiencies of education, occasioned by the growing trend toward welfare statism and the application of progressive education, will have failed of recognition and be pushed into the background of oblivion until these deficiencies are once again seared into our consciousness by a question of survival.

Let no one deceive himself; this is not a defense measure. View it unmasked for what it is—general Federal aid to education, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] said today in response to my inquiry. I admire his frankness in making such a statement. True, the bill has time limits, and the money authorizations could be larger, but it is an entering wedge, and a more general approach is hard to imagine.

Education is one of the few fields in which authority of State and local governments have to date remained comparatively potent. There have been minor Federal inroads before, but the bill will constitute an irreparable breach in the ramparts. There is little Federal control in the bill as proposed; but its ineffectiveness, assured by a fallacious approach, will be the excuse for imposition of Federal regulation by future legislative acts. Experience demonstrates that it is more politically expedient to pile bad legislation on bad legislation, than to resort to the repeal of an unworkable existing program.

Before the measure is voted on, the Senate should realize the dangerous and fallacious philosophy which the bill exemplifies.

Mr. President, I received a telegram today, which I shall read to the Senate.

BISHOPVILLE, S. C., August 12, 1958.
Senator STROM THURMOND,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In spite of strong pressures from Washington education sources, I would like to commend you on your stand on National Defense Education Act of 1958. South Carolina still does not want Federal aid to education, however it may be disguised. Urge your continued efforts to defeat measure.

EDWIN M. CULPEPPER,
President, South Carolina Association
of County Superintendents
of Education.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield time to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. How much time does the Senator from Tennessee desire?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Ten minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opponents have 26 minutes; the proponents 47 minutes.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the bill, I shall speak in its support. First, I congratulate the

Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the committee, and our colleagues on the committee for the leadership they have shown in reporting the bill. I think that no more important legislation has come before the Senate this session than this education bill. I express my gratitude and appreciation to the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama, for their masterful work in formulating the bill and bringing it before us at this time. I have worked with the Senator from Alabama over the years on this legislation and am gratified to see our efforts coming to fruition now.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have been deeply impressed with the need for all-out efforts to recoup our losses in science and technology to the Soviet Union. There is evidence on every hand that the Soviets are advancing much more rapidly in many of the scientific fields, even though we may be ahead of them generally at present. In a few years, we may find that we are indeed a second-rate nation in terms of the world's material and scientific progress.

But we are not concerned only with maintaining pace with the Soviets; we are more concerned with enhancing the economic and cultural standards of the United States. We want to provide our people with the greatest opportunity for self-advancement, for learning and achievement. Only in that way can we realize the potentialities that are inherent in the freedom we find in America.

It is clear that one does not achieve advancement in science or any other scholarly fields merely by giving more money or new facilities to those who are already engaged in such efforts. The key to progress lies in training young people, by instilling in them a desire to achieve, by rewarding their efforts, by encouraging them at every step of the way to excel in their chosen careers.

The shocking fact is that we have failed our children, by not providing these inducements and by not providing the means by which those who can profit by further education may obtain it. We have seen many of our most able students engage in pursuits—all of which may be honorable—not in the field of education or science, or take positions much below their level of achievement, because they could not afford to continue with their education.

The pending bill is a belated recognition of our past remissness in this field. It is an attempt to restore higher education to the place it should occupy in our society. It calls for a cooperative effort on the part of the States, the private schools, and the Federal Government to develop to the fullest the intellectual potentialities of the young people of the Nation.

Some have said the States should do the job alone. I would be first to advise that this course be followed, if it were feasible. But the fact is that the States and the private schools are unable to do the job completely. I say this, not in criticism of them, but merely in making

an objective statement of the situation. The pending bill merely proposes economic assistance to the States, to aid them in the accomplishment of the job which all agree must be accomplished if the Nation and its people are to play their proper roles in the modern world.

I am particularly impressed by the flexibility and breadth of scope of the bill. There is no one reason why some of our young people do not receive as much education as they should. Some are in financial straits; some have insufficient motivation; some have not been able to complete the courses which would prepare them for higher education. The committee has recognized these facts, and has, in reporting the bill, attempted to have it meet the various educational needs of the Nation.

The combination in the bill of the provisions for scholarships based on merit and the provisions for other assistance based on need is particularly meritorious. Thus, the scholarships will be used as inducements for greater attainments in the secondary schools, and also in recognition of outstanding accomplishments there. That is as it should be. A student should not be required to plead poverty, in order to have his achievements receive proper recognition. The scholarship program will be administered by State commissions which will have complete responsibility for the selection of the students who will receive the awards.

The bill also authorizes a program of loans to students who demonstrate superior capabilities. The evidence clearly shows that the student-loan funds now available at the State level are inadequate. As a result, many deserving students have been unable to attend college.

The bill contains specialized provisions to improve the teaching of mathematics, the sciences, and foreign languages. Many of our schools are without the most elementary facilities for scientific education, because of the high cost involved. Obviously, a student's advancement is limited by the training he is able to receive and the use he is able to make of the materials in which he is interested. Other provisions of the bill relate to further training of teachers and graduate students, through institutes and fellowships. Improved guidance, and testing and experimentation with new teaching devices, will result from the grants for these purposes which are made to the States.

I think we realize, Mr. President, that the most precious resource of our country is the younger generation. But our young people need development and refinement, as does any other resource. Too long we have said that those who want to achieve will be able to do so, and that those who do not want to will remain in their uncultivated state. But the evidence is overwhelming to the contrary. We have been ignoring our most precious resource, and thus have been denying our children the right of development, self-expression, and creativity. We have also been saying to the people of the future: "You are not going to have the benefit of maximum develop-

ment, the brains and talent of the present generation."

Mr. President, we can take a long step toward reversing this trend by passing this bill. By injecting a new spirit and a new determination into our educational system, we can keep faith with our young people and with the future of the United States. Our material progress and our spiritual enlightenment depend on it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for the bill he has reported, which is the result of very long and exhaustive hearings, in the course of which many eminent Americans testified.

The pending bill is an excellent one, and will provide substantial help to our hard-pressed educational system.

I testified before the committee headed by the eminent Senator from Alabama. Despite the fact that the pending bill is an excellent one, in my judgment it puts the cart before the horse, in terms of the educational needs of the Nation.

In my judgment, the first priority for assistance to our presently inadequate educational system, which is not measuring up to the needs of our growing population and the needs of our time, should be given to increases in the salaries of the teachers.

The second priority should be given to the construction of additional school facilities.

The third priority should be given to the granting of scholarships and loans to students.

Therefore, Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for having the courage—even though his proposal was rejected by the committee—to propose, here on the floor, his amendment, which provides for at least some funds with which to help the States construct the badly needed schools.

I realize the reason why the distinguished Senator from Michigan has proposed a school-construction amendment, rather than an amendment to provide for increases in the salaries of the teachers, is that he appreciates that the order of priorities must be considered from a practical point of view; that an amendment to provide for increased salaries for teachers will not have a good chance of adoption; and that if the Congress aids the States in connection with the construction of the needed schools, the States, in turn, will then be able to devote more of their own resources to the payment of larger salaries to the teachers.

Mr. President, today the debate on the bill and on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan has been most interesting. I hope the debate immediately

prior to the taking of the vote will be conducted on a high plane. Let us no longer indulge in the use of clichés. Let us no longer say that Federal aid to education will result in Federal control of education. No sensible man believes that the pending bill contains such provisions. The bill, as reported by the committee, makes clear beyond peradventure of doubt that there can be no Federal control of education at the local and State levels.

Let us no longer say, Mr. President, that any constitutional issue worthy of the name is involved.

I do not believe that more than half a dozen lawyers well versed in the law would argue that Federal aid to education poses a legitimate constitutional question. That point was decided at least as long ago as the administration of Abraham Lincoln, when the Land Grant College Act was placed on the statute books. Since that time, that act has provided massive Federal aid to education.

Mr. President, let us no longer say that the States and the localities are better able to make the needed expenditures for our educational system than is the Federal Government. I do not believe that any Member of the Senate who has made a serious study of the problem believes that to be the case; and in a few minutes, I shall submit some facts in connection with that point.

Mr. President, let us no longer say that the deficiencies of our educational system are not due to any extent to a lack of funds. Those who think a lack of funds does not enter into this situation should talk to the teachers, who, as a group, today are paid less than truck-drivers are paid. Those who think a lack of funds is not important in connection with this problem should talk to the parents of children who attend schools which lack adequate equipment; or to the parents of children who attend school on a part-time schedule, and who thus are not receiving the education to which they are entitled; or they should talk to the more than 1 million American young people who this spring graduated from public high schools or private high schools; and, in particular, they should talk to the 200,000 among these young people of high ability—in the upper 25 or 30 percent of their classes—at least half of whom are not attending college because they lack the necessary funds. In short, they should tell that one to the Marines. No one interested in the educational system of America should listen seriously to that statement.

Mr. President, let us stop saying it is the same individual who foots the bill, whether the taxes are raised on the local or State level, or on the Federal level. We all know that is not so. We all know at the local level it is the property tax, the nongraduated property tax, which raises money for the schools. We all know that at the State level, it is, by and large, the broad base sales tax and the nongraduated income tax which raises the money for State participation in schools. We all know that at the Federal level there is in effect a tax system which, with all its deficiencies—and, Mr.

President, believe me, some of those deficiencies were pointed out on the floor of the Senate last night—still has some mild relationship between the capacity of the taxpayer to pay and the tax which is levied against him.

So, Mr. President, let us not have any more of that kind of talk.

Let us also not convert any disagreement we may have on the subject of progressive education into opposition to the bill. The pending bill has nothing whatever to do, one way or the other, with controversial theories of progressive education. All this bill does, and all the pending amendment does, is to make badly needed money available to hard-pressed schools which are unable to give to the boys and girls of America the kind of first-class education which is needed, not only to meet the Soviet challenge—and I agree that the national defense aspects of this bill are important—but also to permit American civilization to move forward at the pace which the brains of America will make possible if we but give our educational agencies and institutions the money they require.

In short, as we move toward a vote on the amendment and a vote on the bill, let us get away from a dream world replete with obsolete thinking, and determine our votes on the basis of facts and not of fiction.

If this body does so, Mr. President, I am confident it will adopt the amendment, and pass the bill in short order. If we do so, we shall take a long step toward putting our American educational system in shape to meet not only the challenge of the Communist world but the basic needs of American civilization.

Mr. President, I shall not even dignify with a rebuttal argument the contention that America cannot afford this bill. Forty billion dollars for defense, and not one billion dollars to see that American boys and girls get the education to which they are entitled. My distinguished colleagues the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Montana have wrapped that illogical argument with a shroud and have buried it.

Mr. President, let me turn briefly to a few basic facts involving my State. Pennsylvania ranks 11th among the States in expenditures per pupil. We are well above the national average in the index of educational effort. During the past 10 years, Pennsylvania has spent \$1 billion on school construction. Fourteen hundred projects are complete or underway. Yet Pennsylvania is falling behind year after year.

Twenty-five thousand pupils were on half-day session last year. The number is increasing. We need from 36,000 to 40,000 classrooms now or in the foreseeable future to end half-day sessions, allow for growth, replace obsolete buildings or makeshift quarters, and consolidate tiny rural districts.

Do not tell the people of Pennsylvania they are not making an adequate effort to educate their children, because the people of Pennsylvania know better.

Mr. President, why is this the situation? A most competent and discerning reporter from the Pittsburgh Sun-Tele-

graph, James F. McCarthy, made a careful analysis of why we are missing the school bus, why bond issues are being turned down when the money is needed, why the States and localities are not measuring up to the challenge of our time.

I shall not detain my colleagues with an amplification of those brilliant articles, but I ask unanimous consent that three of them may appear at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of Sunday, June 29, 1958]

WHY WE'RE MISSING THE SCHOOL BUS—BOND ISSUES TURNED DOWN WHEN THE MONEY IS NEEDED

(By James F. McCarthy)

(On Main Street across America a new problem has arisen to plague the public schools. Digging behind the scenes in American education, the Hearst Headline Service has learned that voters are turning down an increasing number of school bond issues—that we are, in effect, “missing the school bus” in terms of the money needed to keep it running. This is the first of three exclusive articles telling why and examining the meaning of the trend and what's to be done about it.)

In voting booths across the country for the past 2 years Americans have been tightening the purse strings on their public schools.

Hard to believe? Yes, particularly if you passed a new school building going up today and chances are you did. For more schools are going up at present on money authorized 2 or 3 years ago.

But the American voter is now rejecting an increasing number of school bond issues.

In Pittsburgh the need for new schools was reflected most recently in a Sun-Telegraph series on fire hazards in the city schools. The series brought corrective measures, but much of the problem was traceable primarily to antiquated buildings and lack of funds to replace them.

Voters tightened the purse strings on Pittsburgh schools a few years ago when they refused to raise the school district's borrowing authority.

Financial problems for the State government and the school districts themselves combine to make it extremely uncertain that Pennsylvania will be able to build enough new classrooms for an expanding school-age population.

School boards have had to fight hard to win school bond-issue approvals, but a much more serious problem is that fact that many of the State's school districts have reached the limit of their borrowing authority.

Pennsylvania educators recently told the National Education Association:

“Seventy-five to eighty percent of Pennsylvania school districts have insufficient borrowing power to provide themselves with adequate school facilities if the cost of such facilities must be met with general-obligation bonds.

“DEPENDENT UPON STATE

“Without financial assistance from the Commonwealth, the Federal Government, or both, not more than 10 to 15 percent of Pennsylvania's fourth-class school districts can finance, under existing tax limitations, the annual payments made to amortize the cost of new school facilities.”

As local school districts look to the State for building aid they become part of a scramble in which there are many more applicants than there is money to go around.

The legislature in 1956 increased the ceiling on the amount of local school building

construction to be financially aided by the State from \$425 million to \$925 million. The new ceiling already has been reached.

The State department of public instruction reports applications on file amounting to \$450 million or \$350 million in excess of the amount available.

School board members in cities and towns across the country were relying upon the vetoed bond issues to build the new schools of 1960 and beyond in the continuing battle to whack at the national shortage of 142,000 classrooms.

DAWN WILL BREAK

Many parents will realize 2 years from now what is happening when their children are attending overcrowded or double sessions long after such conditions were to have been corrected.

The Investment Bankers Association of America has been passing along to the United States Office of Education data which reveals:

The past 2 years have shown approximate 50 percent decrease in the amount of public and elementary school bond issues passed by the voters.

This has happened for two reasons: fewer bond issues are being offered in the first place and more are being rejected when they do reach the voters.

Go back 2 years to July, 1956. From then until February, 1957, American voters rejected only 9 percent of the bond issues placed before them.

MORE VOTE “NO”

The voters began to balk. Rejections increased and in the period from July, 1957, through February 1958, the rejection rate was 30.4 percent.

November, when voters troop to the polls to decide these questions, is a key month in such studies.

In November, 1956, citizens were asked to approve school bond issues totaling \$448,800,000. They passed \$423,500,000, or all but 5.6 percent.

A year later school boards asked public approval of \$231,800,000 in new school bonds and the people said “Yes” on \$148,800,000. The rejection rate had climbed to 35.8 percent.

Why?

Educators think they have found several reasons for the trend. But even the most ardent supporters of more money for schools mix with their reasons a strong note of sympathy for the taxpayers.

COSTS CONSIDERED

Today, more than ever before, voters know what an interest rate means. Interest on a typical district school bond has risen from 2.17 percent in 1951 to 3.22 percent as of March.

Smaller school districts sometimes must market bonds at nearly 4 percent, if at all.

This is expensive debt service and the public knows it.

More voters are also aware that debt service must be met before teacher salaries or any other school expenses.

With the debt service share of the local school budget rising to 25 percent and higher, voters now are translating new bond issues into terms of higher taxes and they don't like it, particularly in a recession.

Reluctance to assume higher property taxes at a time of economic decline is another big reason for more bond issue rejections. Figures bear this out in Michigan, Pennsylvania, and other States hit by heavy unemployment.

DIRECT TAX BLAMED

But perhaps the biggest factors are psychological.

Property owners have watched local and State debt increase by more than 350 percent in the past 11 years. They are paying higher income, sales, and property taxes.

It is the real estate tax, mainstay of public education, that is paid in one big lump sum once or twice a year.

Research has established that most people must save in advance to pay these taxes, dip into savings, or borrow.

In any event, it is the property tax over which the man down the block has most control and the one he is less likely to raise if he can help it.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of Monday, July 7, 1958]

WHY WE'RE MISSING THE SCHOOL BUS—BOND REJECTIONS ALARMING

(By James F. McCarthy)

(American voters are turning down an increasing number of school-bond issues. Here, in the second of three articles on this vital behind-the-scenes story in public education, the Hearst Headline Service tells what the trend means, including the reaction of United States Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick in an exclusive interview—the first since returning from an eye-opening survey of education in Russia).

WASHINGTON.—“A contest has been imposed on us whether we like it or not. Russia has picked us out as her chief rival and has chosen education as the route to world supremacy.”

This was United States Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick speaking.

Like other educators, Derthick is watching uneasily as American voters reject an increasing number of school-bond issues.

We asked his reaction and, naturally enough for one who had just returned from heading a 10-man team of American educators on a month-long survey of Russian education, Derthick interpreted even hometown school finance in terms of world challenge.

First to understand what a trend of school bond issue rejections may mean someday, what will happen to our national school bus if we fail to provide money to keep it running, we must examine the construction job ahead for the public schools.

Dr. Lyman V. Ginger, president of the National Education Association, brought home the facts dramatically in testimony before the House Subcommittee on General Education.

Explosive population growth in the past 11 years has boosted the school group (ages 5 through 17) 40.8 percent or from 28.6 million to 40.2 million. School enrollment will rise another 15.5 percent by 1965.

Even if communities build the 70,500 new classrooms scheduled for completion by this fall, Dr. Ginger insists the classroom shortage will be 132,000.

NEA believes these figures prove the Nation is doing little more than whittling away at the backlog, even on funds from the heavy bond issue approvals of 2 years ago.

This is why Dr. Ginger views any increase in the bond issue rejection rate as alarming. Despite more State school aid, he reminded Congressmen that local bond issues are still the primary source of funds for school construction.

He talked of a time lag of from 2 to 3 years between bond issue approval and the opening of a new school.

Thus, educators view rising bond issue rejections as meaning more years of crowded classes and part-time sessions.

A child in a part-time session loses 2 months training in the course of a school year because of the shortage of material covered. In 12 years of schooling under such conditions he loses 2 years.

Educators have translated the time loss into lost money and manpower—lost money in individual earnings and community prosperity and lost manpower for the military and industry.

LEADERSHIP AT STAKE

Let Derthick tell what a rising rate of bond-issue rejections could mean in larger world struggle terms * * *

Words like "amazement" and "astonishment" are well used, Derthick said, in describing his reaction to what he is convinced is a total Soviet commitment to education. He added:

"Our complacency about providing the resources to train our manpower is disturbing."

He agreed with those who have warned we could lose the contest in 10 or 15 years through complacency and emphasized:

"I'm not talking about a war. I'm talking about the race for world leadership."

FREEDOM IS A PLUS

Basically optimistic about the future for school construction, Derthick pointed to a long American tradition of local and State control of education and said any solution to the problem will have to hinge on having enough people at the local level willing to put the force of their leadership behind the cause of more schools.

He called this an unenforceable obligation which people must assume from their hearts. Derthick is convinced:

"We have a system that will do the job if we improve our poor and neglected schools. Those people over there (in Russia) have a blueprint but we have freedom—freedom to make our system superior if citizens are willing to go all the way."

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of Tuesday, July 1, 1958]

WHY WE'RE MISSING THE SCHOOL BUS—
MONEY LACKING, PUBLIC HESITATES TO
RAISE TAXES

(By James F. McCarthy)

(A rising rate of school bond issue rejections is today's top story behind the scenes in public education. In this, the last of three exclusive articles on the grassroots problem of "Why We're Missing the School Bus," the Hearst Headline Service examines solutions to meet the schools' financial plight).

WASHINGTON.—"Give enough people the facts on education and we will solve all our school problems," United States Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick told the Hearst newspapers.

But even with all the facts, taxpayers throughout the land face a difficult choice in deciding the financial future of America's schools.

A rising rate of school bond issue rejection proves this.

What's to be done about it?

Assuming a widespread, deep-rooted citizen desire to improve the public educational plant physically and academically, taxpayers have three basic choices:

They can float more bond issues to build more schools, accepting higher local property tax rates in the process.

Local communities can insist that Federal and State governments free more tax revenue sources for local use; or

The public can force Congress to enact Federal aid for classroom construction; thus shifting some of the school finance load directly to the Federal Government.

Psychologists have suggested the simple device of billing local real estate taxpayers monthly to avoid large annual payments. But there is a substantial body of opinion which holds that the local real-estate tax is just about as high as it can go.

Serious fears of loss of population and industry in the face of higher taxes prompts many communities to think twice before raising either the tax rate or property assessments.

This same fear is voiced by opponents of the President's suggestion that governors

decide which functions and tax sources could better be turned over to the States.

BORROWING CAPACITY EXHAUSTED

Uncle Sam, according to latest estimates, could release to State and local governments new tax sources yielding about \$2 billion a year if State and local governments in turn assumed a proportionately higher share of governmental function.

But local pressures, political and otherwise raise this question: What guaranty is there that State and local governments, once given the new tax sources, would put higher taxes into effect?

Another problem in the school finance picture is the fact that more and more school districts each year exhaust their borrowing capacity.

A specific remedy for the school bond issue problem was advanced by Representative FRANK M. CLARK, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who has introduced a bill which would create a domestic bank with Federal revolving funds.

The bank's functions would be to purchase local school bond issues which communities are unable to market privately at less than 3 percent interest.

AID PLAN GAINS

With the notable exception of the United States Chamber of Commerce, organizations watching the school-construction picture have seized upon the rising rate of bond issue rejections as a crowning argument in favor of Federal aid for classroom construction.

The National Education Association is the principle nonpartisan backer of such a plan. Many in the United States Office of Education feel the same way but they are not saying much about it in public since the administration decision to soft-pedal Federal aid for classroom construction and push Federal science scholarships.

There are many in the national office, however, who see elementary and secondary classroom construction as a more basic need.

WHAT'S YOUR CHOICE?

Public polls in the past 2 years have shown increasing support for such Federal aid.

NEA told Congress:

"The fact is that State and local governments have been making a superb fiscal effort and that they can and should do even more.

"But even with their utmost efforts, their tax sources will simply not suffice to maintain elementary and secondary education at its present level or quality, let alone raise it to the levels of superiority required for the carrying out of urgent national policies directed toward economic growth and world leadership."

These, then, are the remedial choices in the face of declining revenue from school bonds.

Mr. CLARK. Primarily, Mr. President, there are four reasons why the States and the localities cannot measure up to this educational challenge.

First, because of the inadequacy of the property tax.

Second, because of the problem of tax competition, as a result of which industries will desert a State which has high educational standards and go to a State which starves its schools, starves its teachers, starves its children's education. Nobody knows that better than does the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who had the problem of tax competition very much before him, as did the distinguished Governor of Michigan, not too long ago.

The third reason is that State and local governments are under greater fi-

nancial strain than is the Federal Government. This is demonstrated beyond doubt by the statistics which show that since the war local and State taxation and local and State debt have grown rapidly and drastically while the Federal debt has actually declined and the Federal tax burden in relation to the gross national product has actually become lighter.

Finally, Mr. President, let us admit that there is some absence of will; there are some parents, there are some persons without children who prefer a mediocre school system to voting for a bond issue or for local taxes which are necessary to bring the educational system up to the level which is needed.

For those four reasons, I think any sincere student of the problem will appreciate that America will continue to fall farther and farther behind in the education of her youth unless Federal aid—and massive Federal aid—is brought to bear on this problem.

Our educational problems are growing more serious, not better; they are deepening, not bottoming out. It has been estimated by objective and learned civic groups that our expenditures for education must be doubled in the next decade. This money will not be raised by State and local effort alone. The time for the Federal Government to start forward to meet its share of the total obligation is now, not next year or the year after.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Aid to education is vital to national defense. The brainpower of our youth is surely our most valuable asset.

Before the Senate votes, I again thank my colleagues who have spoken in support of the school construction amendment. I know they feel as deeply as I do that a meaningful program of Federal aid to the States for school construction is vitally needed.

It is especially pleasing to me to see the bipartisan support which the amendment has. Certainly if there is any area which should be completely devoid of partisanship it is the area of education.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bennett	Butler
Allott	Bible	Byrd
Anderson	Bricker	Capehart
Barrett	Bridges	Carlson
Beall	Bush	Carroll

Case, N. J.	Javits	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Jenner	Pastore
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Clark	Johnston, S. C.	Proxmire
Cooper	Jordan	Purtell
Cotton	Kefauver	Revercomb
Curtis	Kennedy	Robertson
Douglas	Kerr	Russell
Dworshak	Knowland	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Ellender	Langer	Smathers
Ervin	Lausche	Smith, Maine
Frear	Long	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Magnuson	Sparkman
Goldwater	Malone	Stennis
Gore	Mansfield	Symington
Green	Martin, Iowa	Talmadge
Hayden	Martin, Pa.	Thurmond
Hennings	McClellan	Thye
Hickenlooper	McNamara	Watkins
Hill	Monroney	Wiley
Hoblitzell	Morse	Williams
Hruska	Morton	Yarborough
Humphrey	Mundt	Young
Ives	Murray	
Jackson	Neuberger	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent on official business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral services of Congressman McVey.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I feel fairly certain that at this point we are deciding what is probably the most important amendment which will be offered to the education defense bill which is now before us.

I am fully aware of the intentions and purposes of Senators who have offered this amendment. Many of us, myself included, have on one or more occasions offered similar amendments.

At the beginning of this year the President, seeing the great need for education, particularly in the scientific and mathematical fields, recommended this bill, in substance—a bill to increase the emphasis upon education in the United States, to help the teachers develop themselves, and, in general, to raise the educational level.

It was realized that we were falling behind the Soviets in many respects. It is not that we are behind now, but unless we change our situation we shall be very far behind before long.

With respect to the pending amendment, as I say, many of us have offered similar amendments in the past, and such amendments got exactly nowhere.

I think it is a matter of common knowledge that it is impossible to get a school construction bill through the other body, and that the result of adding this amendment to the bill would be sim-

ply to preclude any educational help this year.

It is a hard choice to make, when one realizes the great necessities for school buildings in many areas of the country. But I say to my friends in the Senate that if they want this bill, to gear up the educational processes to the level on which they must be, if we are to compete in this modern world of science, mathematics, and language skills to communicate our thoughts and ideals to other men's minds, we shall have to do something along the lines of this bill. In doing so, we must be fairly certain that it will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes allotted to the Senator from Colorado have expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I know there is little chance of the bill being passed if the pending amendment is attached to it. Therefore I believe the issue narrows down to this: No matter what a Senator's ideas or feelings may be with respect to the pending amendment, if he feels that there is a need for educational assistance, and if he believes that there is a need for the pending bill, then, regardless of how much he may favor the amendment, he must vote against it.

Upon that basis I personally shall vote against it, and I hope my colleagues will join me.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in opposition to the amendment, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will take only a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment. It is difficult for me to be opposed to it, because since 1952 or 1953, both the Senator from Alabama and I have been working strenuously to have a school construction bill passed, without success. We worked for legislation in the Senate. In the House others were working for the same kind of bill at the same time. The House has repeatedly defeated a school construction bill. This year, when the sputnik caused somewhat of a scare, there was a feeling in all quarters that the center of gravity had changed with respect to a school construction bill. With sputnik, we realized we had to take a new look, and that we had to think in terms of national safety and in terms of training scientists and in terms of building up our training facilities as constructively and as intelligently as we could.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has done a wonderful job with his insistence on keeping the school construction issue before our people and before our committee. He fought strenuously for it. He knows why some of us cannot vote for his amendment.

He knows we are in sympathy with what he is trying to do. He knows, as all of us know, that we have not even

scratched the surface with respect to the overall educational situation.

We are considering a bill which has a chance of being passed, in the light of previous action in the House. Of course, the bill will have to go to conference. Time is short. I do not believe it would be possible to get the bill passed if the pending amendment were added to it, as the Senator from Colorado has said.

I should like to make it perfectly clear for the RECORD that I believe what the Senator from Michigan has done in dramatizing this issue is in agreement with the feeling of practically every member of the committee, with possibly 1 or 2 exceptions.

Both at this session and at previous sessions I introduced, for the administration, school construction bills. I was anxious to move ahead in that field. I do not believe we can add the pending amendment to the bill without destroying any hope of enacting school legislation this year.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and those of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

In 1947, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I introduced a bill, which Senator Taft introduced in the Senate. My State of Kentucky stands probably in as much need of school construction as any other State. However, I feel it would burden the bill if we adopted the pending amendment. Therefore, I intend to vote against it. The sponsors of the amendment have done a great service in keeping the matter before us. However, I believe we would encumber and endanger the passage of the bill if we were to complicate the issue at this time by adding the amendment to the bill.

As I say, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey and the remarks of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. One more parting word of praise for the Senator from Michigan. I hope in the future he will see his hopes realized by the enactment of a school-construction bill. I again must say to him that I regret I cannot vote for his amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, no one honors or appreciates the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for his devoted and consistent and persistent efforts in behalf of the cause of education more than does the Senator from Alabama. Surely the cause could have no greater or devoted champion than the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I honor and appreciate him, as I do all the Senators who are associated with him in sponsoring the amendment.

Like the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, I, too, have offered bills for school construction. I have supported them. I have done my best to bring about the passage of legislation for

school construction. Certainly tonight I would not in any way fail to recognize the need for additional school buildings and more and better classrooms. However, I do not believe we should attach any amendment to the pending bill which would invite the defeat of the bill. I firmly believe that if the pending school-construction amendment were added to the bill, it would be the end of the bill, and there would be no legislation on education passed at this session of Congress.

I have before me a telegram, dated August 12, yesterday, addressed to me, which reads as follows:

The National Education Association and its affiliate units are 100 percent in support of the bill S. 4237 without amendments. This is our official position, and we are making every effort to help you secure its enactment.

The telegram was signed by J. L. McCaskill of the National Education Association.

Mr. President, we know that the National Education Association is a great association of teachers, educators, and school officials. It is an association not only of teachers and educators and school officials in our elementary and secondary schools, but in colleges and other higher institutions of learning as well. The National Education Association, in sending the telegram, has done that which we—Senator SMITH of New Jersey and Senator ALLOTT and others of us on the committee—are doing, namely, recognizing a practical situation, that is, to add the amendment to the bill would be fatal to the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am of the same opinion as my distinguished friend from Alabama. Many of us have worked and supported a school-construction bill. A year ago I voted for such a bill. I, too, feel that we will have to pass such a bill. However, we are faced with the fact that even though the Senate passed a school-construction bill a year ago, we did not succeed in having it enacted. We cannot succeed this year. Therefore, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and I wish to associate myself, also, with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Those Senators, to my knowledge, have been in the forefront of the endeavor to develop a better educational system in this land. They recognize the practical question which confronts us. They understand the practical situation which will result if we vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes. I yield further to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Much as we might desire to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, to do so would foreclose the enactment of the scholarship provision and the other beneficial provisions of the bill, because we would then have destroyed the opportunities we are proposing for educational development, as are provided in the committee bill.

Therefore, although I have voted for school construction in the past, I shall have to vote "nay" on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HILL. As a staunch and devoted friend of education, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota recognizes the practical situation. He is trying to do the best he can for the cause of education. He knows he cannot do his best if he votes to attach the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the bill.

Mr. THYE. The distinguished Senator from Alabama and I have served together for many years on the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor Appropriations. At no time would we take a step backward or away from helping to develop the health, education, and welfare of the people. But we are confronted with a practical situation. We know of the action of the House. We know exactly what happened to a school construction bill a year ago. Therefore, we think we had better take a course which will achieve our purpose rather than defeat it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, with the understanding that the time shall be charged against that of the proponents of the amendment?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think there is no other Senator who has a higher regard than I have for the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and for the magnificent work he has done in having the bill reported by the committee.

Why is it that he and all our friends on this side of the aisle think that to agree to the amendment will defeat the bill? Are they afraid that the President of the United States, who recommended a \$4 billion program for school construction not so long ago, will veto the bill? Do they think that by passing the bill and taking it to conference with this amendment included, they will have irrevocably destroyed the possibility of the ultimate passage of the bill? After all, many things happen in conference. It might be a wise thing for the Senate to study.

Will the Senator from Alabama enlighten us as to why the adoption of the amendment will have a bad effect on the fate of the bill?

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to enlighten the Senator from Pennsylvania. All the Senate has to do is to recall the record. The House of Representatives, 2 years ago, rejected a school-construction bill. The House of Representatives, a year ago, voted down a school-construction bill. This year the House Committee on Education and Labor refused even to report to the House a school-construction bill.

Ever since World War I—all these 40 years—the National Education Association and other organizations representing teachers, educators, and school officials, together with parent-teacher associations, and their friends in Congress, have tried to have an education bill passed. Beginning 40 years ago with what is known as the Sterling-Towner bill, there has been a strong effort to pass an education bill. Many committees and commissions have been established to study education bills.

I recall one commission, which was headed by that very distinguished American citizen, Owen D. Young, chairman of the board of General Electric Co. He and other men of that caliber recommended education bills. So there have been many recommendations. Yet for 40 years not a single education bill ever saw the light of day in the House of Representatives until the passage of this bill by the House at this session of Congress.

Senators will recall that in the 79th Congress, the Senate passed the so-called Thomas-Hill bill, providing Federal funds for education. That bill went to the House committee, and there it died. The committee refused even to report the bill to the House.

In the next Congress, the 80th Congress, the Senate passed the Taft aid-to-education bill. That bill met the same fate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes allotted to the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama allots himself 5 additional minutes.

The Taft bill was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor, and there it died. The committee refused even to report the bill. The House committees, for 40 years, have failed to report any bill for education. This is the first time in 40 years that an education bill has passed the House of Representatives.

We know of the opposition of the House to school-construction legislation. Why should we now, when we have this opportunity to pass a bill for education, attach an amendment which will mean that another session of Congress will go by without any legislation for education?

The bill before the Senate tonight meets the immediate and direct responsibility of the Federal Government for the defense of the country and the conduct of our foreign affairs. I think all of us will agree that it was this responsibility which was the great motivation for the formation of the Federal Government. We, as Senators of the Federal Government, must meet the responsibility of the Federal Government for the national defense and the conduct of our foreign affairs.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported the bill to the Senate to meet that responsibility. We ask and urge the Senate not to kill the bill by attaching to it the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. Let us pass the bill without that amendment; then, for the first time in 40 years, we will have the legislation which we have long sought.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Speaking from experience and as a one-time chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I am satisfied that if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is adopted, there will be no bill on education this year.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Vermont is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I have had experience in such matters.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Vermont has served for many years as a distinguished and active member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He has had considerable experience as a member of the committees of conference of the Senate and House. He speaks with authority from that experience. He knows whereof he speaks. He is absolutely correct.

Mr. AIKEN. A vote for the amendment will be a vote against education.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for the kind remarks he made concerning my feeble efforts. I also thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the other Senators who have been so charitable in their remarks concerning my efforts in behalf of school construction.

But I do not share their feelings that to add my amendment to the scholarship bill would have the effect they think it would. I call attention to the fact that last year the House came within a few votes of passing a school construction bill. I am certain there is much more sentiment this year in the House than there was last year for a Federal aid to school construction bill.

Much has been said about the amendment. I hope every Senator who has taken a stand publicly for Federal aid to education will vote for the amendment. If every Senator will vote according to his conscience, the amendment will carry overwhelmingly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, let me inquire which side the Senator from Arizona is on, in connection with the pending amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, no one but myself knows which side I am on. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, my minority views on the bill are, I believe, the shortest ever written in the history of the Senate. In those views, I state the following:

This bill and the foregoing remarks of the majority remind me of an old Arabian proverb:

If the camel once gets his nose in the tent, his body will soon follow.

If adopted, the legislation will mark the inception of aid, supervision, and ultimately control of education in this country by Federal authorities.

Mr. President, by means of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senate tonight is given a chance to vote to permit the camel to get both his hump and his head under the tent at the same time. The effort to permit the camel—to get the rest of his body—and at this time I shall not go into detail, in that connection—under the tent will come next year or the year following.

Mr. President, education at any level cannot be subsidized by the Federal Government without ultimately having Federal-Government control follow, even down to the textbooks used, the qualifications of the teachers, the salaries paid to the teachers, and so forth, and so forth.

Mr. President, I find great difficulty in reaching my decision as to how I shall vote on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. If I honestly believed that adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan would destroy the bill, I would vote for the amendment.

On the other hand, when the time comes to vote on the question of the passage of the bill, I will vote against it, because I will not vote to penalize my State and to penalize my children and my grandchildren, and I will not vote for the downfall of our free Republic, by voting to permit further chiseling at the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if the Senator who has control of the time available to Senators who oppose the amendment is willing to yield back the remainder of the time under his control, I shall do likewise.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. McNAMARA. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], on behalf of himself and other Senators.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "nay."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral services of Congressman McVey and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—30

Beall	Humphrey	Murray
Carroll	Jackson	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Javits	O'Mahoney
Church	Kefauver	Pastore
Clark	Kennedy	Potter
Cooper	Langer	Proxmire
Douglas	Magnuson	Revercomb
Fulbright	Mansfield	Smathers
Gore	McNamara	Symington
Hennings	Morse	Yarborough

NAYS—61

Aiken	Goldwater	Monroney
Allott	Green	Morton
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bennett	Hill	Robertson
Bible	Hoblitzell	Russell
Bricker	Hruska	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Schoepel
Bush	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Capehart	Jordan	Stennis
Carlson	Kerr	Talmadge
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Thurmond
Cotton	Kuchel	Thye
Curtis	Lausche	Watkins
Dworshak	Long	Wiley
Eastland	Malone	Williams
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Young
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	
Frear	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—5

Chavez	Flinders	Payne
Dirksen	Holland	

So the amendment offered by Mr. McNAMARA for himself and other Senators was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the McNamara amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 13. An act for the relief of Hsiu-Kwang Wu and Hsiu-Huang Wu;
 S. 92. An act for the relief of Robert Karia;
 S. 160. An act for the relief of Georgios Ioannou;
 S. 228. An act for the relief of the Chamberlain Water Co., of Chamberlain, S. Dak.;
 S. 400. An act for the relief of Paul Thury;
 S. 489. An act for the relief of Mary K. Ryan and William A. Boutwell;
 S. 761. An act for the relief of Charles C. and George C. Finn;

private planes were in competition for airspace with more than 30,000 military aircraft. The civilian flyers were subject to civil air regulations but the military has largely been exempted from effective traffic control.

The Senate-approved bill would create a unified Federal Aviation Agency headed by a civilian administrator. He would have authority to allocate airspace and enforce rules for both military and civilian aircraft and airfields. He would also develop and operate a common system of air navigation facilities.

The measure now goes to President Eisenhower who is expected to sign it, as he should. The worst that can be said about the bill is that it is long overdue.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 15, 1958]

FOR A SINGLE AIR AGENCY

We agree with Senator MONRONEY, Oklahoma Democrat, that one of the prime necessities of our time is a single Federal agency to regulate and control aviation, both civilian and military. MONRONEY is the chief sponsor of a single-agency bill which came up for debate in the Senate yesterday.

"Only the silent prayer of the men who fly the airways can account for the fact that more Americans have not died in midair collisions," the Oklahoma Senator said yesterday. That is true. Several weeks ago, following several such disasters, reports of hairbreadth escapes from smashups between military and civilian planes were almost daily occurrences.

Under two similar bills now in Congress, a single Federal Aviation Agency, in charge of a civilian administrator, would have authority to allocate airspace and control its use. The Civil Aeronautics Board would remain in existence in the broader setup but its job would be to regulate the economics of the industry on questions of routes and rates.

But the vital need is for a board to have overall power to lay down rules for all air traffic, with the object of eliminating the risks of midair collisions whether in the area of landing fields or on flying courses. Such a single agency should be established by Congress at this session, without fail.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237), the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments offered on behalf of myself and Senators CLARK, HUMPHREY, and McNAMARA, and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 16, between lines 3 and 4, to insert a new section as follows:

PAYMENTS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

SEC. 208. (a) The Commissioner shall make payments to each institution of higher education in the States on account of the attendance at such institution of each person who has a national defense scholarship. Such payments shall be made at the rate of \$500 per academic year for each academic year or portion thereof of attendance by such person within the duration of such scholarship.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

On page 2, to amend the table of contents by inserting after "Sec. 207. Administrative Expenses of State Commissions," the following:

"Sec. 208. Payments to institutions of higher education."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as should be clear from the individual views I filed on this bill with four of my colleagues on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I believe that S. 4237 falls far short of an adequate education program for America. Even in terms of higher education alone—and the needs in higher education are only a small part of the total need—the bill is not adequate, in my opinion.

It was demonstrated in the hearings held by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee early this spring that the great shortage in trained minds results more from lack of facilities than from any shortage of the raw material of good minds. Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University, a land-grant school in Indiana, testified that the supply of qualified teachers is the No. 1 requirement in higher education. He also called for a greatly expanded program of financial assistance to institutions of higher learning for the expansion of facilities. On page 92 of the hearings, he stated:

In the next decade we know that the number of students who will go on from our high schools into college will double, at least. My own institution, if we continue to take only the percentage we have taken in the postwar years of high-school graduates, has a potential of going to 30,000 students by 1970.

The present enrollment at Purdue is about 13,000.

Under Secretary Perkins of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare testified that helping finance the student today was only the beginning.

He told the committee:

The second problem that will confront higher education in the not-so-far-distant future is that of the overwhelming number of youngsters born in the postwar years who will soon be presenting themselves to colleges. Then the hardship worked by scholarships on institutions by encouraging more than the normal amount of youngsters to come into college will be very real indeed. Difficult as the situation may be in some colleges, it will be much more desperate in the times that I have indicated that are not so far off.

He fixed this time as "from 3 to 4 years, and it will continue for many years to come. It is variously estimated, but roughly I think the increase in the college population in 1970 will be 70 to 100 percent over what it has been in recent years." That testimony is on page 258 of the hearings.

Dr. M. H. Trytten, a physicist now serving as Director of the Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Academy of Sciences, classified the needs of our schools as follows:

First of all, our greatest need is for more and better qualified teachers. We need to encourage more of our able young people to choose teaching as a career, to provide superior educational opportunities for them in preparation for teaching, and to enhance the status of the profession and raise salaries commensurate with the services required.

Secondly, our schools, colleges, and universities need more money for facilities and equipment if they are to accommodate the vastly increasing numbers of students.

Thirdly, some additional financial support to needy students should be made available, so that our top students are not prevented from attending college, or university, because of financial hardship.

Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, Executive Director of the Scientific Manpower Commission told the committee on page 1,000 of the hearings:

We are not short of students. Our high schools and our colleges have the largest enrollments in history. More youngsters are earning high-school diplomas than ever before, and approximately one-third of them are now entering institutions of higher learning. And more of them are paying their own way than ever before.

In September of 1957, 297,100 students were enrolled in engineering—the highest enrollment on record, not even excluding the GI bulge of 1947-48, when 244,400 engineering students were enrolled. Although precise figures are not available for students of science, the situation in our departments of science is approaching and roughly parallels that in colleges of engineering.

There is need, therefore, to channel more young people into these professional fields, even though we must take appropriate steps to continue the normal and ever-increasing flow. What we do need is to insure that the young people who are entering our institutions of higher learning in greater numbers will not get the second-rate education that Dr. Maul forecasts.

A first-rate education can be guaranteed only if there are faculties, facilities, and finances ample to do the job at the higher educational level, and only if there are teachers at the primary and secondary school levels to give our young people the grounding in basic subjects that makes the difference between success and failure in college.

Important as finances are, the entire solution of the problem of quality and quantity lies in the supply of teachers, well trained, and dedicated to the task of giving the Nation what it needs in brainpower for its welfare, progress, and security. Legislation that does not have this as a primary aim will not meet the need of the moment or of the future.

To the extent that the bill that is receiving this committee's serious consideration meets this need and encourages better teaching of basic subjects in our high schools, it has the Scientific Manpower Commission's hearty endorsement.

The reference Dr. Meyerhoff made here was to a study by Ray Maul, research director of the National Education Association.

I especially wish to invite to the attention of the Senate the statement made to the committee by the representatives of the American Council on Education.

The Council members include 140 educational organizations and 1,005 institutions, among them nearly all the accredited colleges, universities, and junior colleges in the United States.

The American Council on Education has often called attention to the need for a Federal scholarship program, and the scholarship bill I introduced last year with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] was in large part worked out by the council. But as was made clear by J. B. Culpeper of the Board of Control of Florida for State Institutions of Higher Learning, the council recognizes that scholarships are only a small part of the need.

Mr. Culpeper's testimony on behalf of the American Council on Education begins on page 399 of the hearings. I shall quote his testimony in a moment, but before I do so I wish to say that if my southern friends in the Senate will study the hearings of the committee I think they will be surprised to note that many a southern educator came before our committee and testified of the need of Federal aid to education and specifically of the kind of relief and aid the amendment I now have pending before the Senate would provide.

Representatives of public institutions, for example, from Arkansas, Mississippi, Georgia, Florida, and other southern States came forward and made the plea, as I and other Senators have been making it in the Senate for many years, for the kind of assistance we are asking for in this amendment and in other amendments we seek to offer to the bill.

I say to the able chairman of my committee that the fact that I stand here on the floor of the Senate and offer this amendment and support other amendments is in no way a reflection upon the great statesmanship the Senator from Alabama has shown and the leadership he has given us on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But it should be understood by Members of the Senate that apparently the Senator from Alabama has taken the position that the bill he is offering is a bill which he thinks has the best hope of passage in the Senate this year. There are those of us on the committee who, first, do not agree with his premise, and second, who take the position that we ought to try to get the best bill possible. We ought to offer amendments to the bill reported by the Senator from Alabama which will give us a well-rounded education bill.

The Senator from Alabama will find us standing shoulder to shoulder with him in support of his loan and scholarship proposals in this bill, and we expect in the future to have him again with us, shoulder to shoulder, as he has been so many times in the past, in support of a much broader educational program, such as that encompassed in the amendments we have offered, including as the school construction amendment just offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and defeated by the Senate.

To go to the testimony of the other southern educators who appeared before the committee, I quote from the testimony of Mr. Culpeper on behalf of the American Council on Education, beginning on page 399 of the hearings:

But the fear that really disturbs us is the prospect that unless drastic action is taken, and taken soon, we shall have in 1970 nearly 2 million high-school graduates ready for higher education for whom no opportunity exists because of lack of classrooms or laboratories for them. * * *

What do we need in order to expand our facilities, including both enlargement of existing institutions and creation of new institutions, in the next decade? The latest estimate of the United States Office of Education, based on the Preliminary Report of the College and University Facilities Survey, 1951-55, is that the cost, on a conservative basis, will be \$18 billion. Accordingly, in order to keep abreast of the most urgent needs, we must spend nearly \$2 billion a year for the next decade.

The survey shows that expenditures for facilities are now averaging only \$750 million a year. If this rate continues, there will be a deficit in needed capital outlay of \$10.5 billion by 1968, meaning that we will have provided accommodations for little more than a third of the 3 million additional students anticipated.

These figures, I point out, do not take into account a new scholarship program which would add additional students to the enrollments already anticipated. Of course, the number of scholarships provided in S. 4237 is meager; it allows for only 23,000, when the American Council on Education figures show that about 100,000 high-school graduates capable of doing college work do not go on to college for lack of financial resources.

That is why I say that the greatest waste in America these days is human waste. The greatest waste in America today is the waste of potential brainpower. It is to our national shame; I think it is a sad reflection on our country that it is possible for United States Senators to stand on the floor of the Senate this afternoon and quote these unanswerable figures which convict us of such a human waste.

Those of us who are offering these amendments are doing so from a dedicated devotion to the needs of future generations of Americans in respect to providing them with a heritage of education which will make it possible for them, in turn, to strengthen America in the great contest with totalitarianism over the next century.

Yet even if we do not do anything to aid these students, we are still faced with the problem of educating those students who do not need financial assistance—the ones who simply need schools to attend. Therefore, the Council recommended:

That in addition to approving continuation of the housing-loan program on the present basis with additional authorization for funds, the Congress should establish a new program of financial assistance to institutions of higher learning for construction of academic facilities of the kinds they require to meet their educational objectives. * * * The recommendation is an initial appropriation of \$125 million for grants and \$250 million for loans.

When the question was raised about making grants to private institutions, Dr. Culpeper replied:

There are those who take a different position from that which is supported by the Council. But we have a critical situation here in a need for facilities. If we do not make these grants to the private institutions, so the Council states, then the alter-

nate to providing those facilities would be for public funds from some level to go to construction of new institutions. This would cost more and require longer.

The critical need is to provide the facilities for these 3 million new students out and beyond the present 3 million that we have. We must move as quickly and as judiciously as we can to accommodate these young people of superior capacity.

The president of American University, Dr. Hurst R. Anderson, also testified for the American Council on Education. Dr. Anderson presented the Council proposal that a \$500 grant to the institution accompany each scholarship awarded. That is the basis for the amendment I have offered, which is pending. I quote his testimony on page 408 of the hearings:

Neither the Hill nor the Smith bill makes any substantial provision for the additional costs that must be borne by the colleges by reason of the enrollment of scholarship holders. In our opinion this is a serious omission. Even without a Federal scholarship program it is estimated that the number of college students in this country will double by 1970. How can the institutions provide the facilities, the larger faculties, and the laboratories? The local communities, the States, and private sources have basic responsibility, but anybody who has read the reports on school-bond elections in the last year knows that local sources of finance have strict limitations.

Dr. Anderson continued:

We do not expect you to bail us out wholly, but we do think if the Federal Government wants us to do something about this, at least you ought to help us with the additional students you throw on our shoulders with the scholarship program. We really feel this very strongly. I cannot emphasize this too much * * *. You cannot give (a student) \$2,000 to go to a university when you cannot find a university that can afford to give him an education.

It sounds fine to say to the country, "We propose to provide 23,000 scholarships to students," but it is a disservice to the colleges of America, and it is unfair to them to place upon them the burden of educating those students unless we are willing to make some contribution to the institution which receives students, to help defray the cost of their education, over and above the contribution of the scholarships to their education.

Before I finish, I shall refer to some statistics to point out what that additional cost is. Let me state it from memory now.

By and large, in the State colleges the student's tuition is about 14 percent of the cost to the State, taken through the school year.

In private institutions, by and large, the average tuition fees the student pays covers about 50 percent of the cost to the institution for educating the student. What the college presidents who testified in support of the principle of my amendment said to us in committee—and Dr. Anderson's testimony is very clear and unequivocal on this point, as is the testimony of the other witnesses—was, in effect, that it is not fair or right that we pass a scholarship bill which would place a good many students in the colleges unless we are willing also to make to the institutions a contribution

to the cost of educating the students over and above what the scholarships bring in by way of tuition fees. I believe that is only fair and right.

I now wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the statements made on behalf of the great land-grant colleges and universities. Among the witnesses for these institutions were Dr. John Caldwell, president of the University of Arkansas, and Dr. Russell Thackrey, executive secretary of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges, among others. This association represents 70 colleges and universities, including 68 land-grant institutions, plus Georgia Institute of Technology and the State University of New York. Dr. Caldwell also spoke for the State Universities Association, representing 24 State universities which are not land-grant institutions.

Here is what this group told us about education needs:

Both bills (the Hill bill and Smith bill) with some exceptions which I shall mention represent a long-range attack on educational problems, with heavy emphasis on the improvement of science, mathematics, and language instruction in our elementary and secondary schools. Neither piece of legislation, again with 1 or 2 exceptions, contains provisions which will substantially improve our scientific and technological effort and our competitive position in the world in which we live, during the next 10 years. Doctoral-degree candidates of 7 to 10 years from now will come from the class entering college next fall. The quality and adequacy of college faculties and facilities are the essential determinative factors of the quality and quantity of our highly trained leadership over the next decade, and indeed, will always be major factors. * * *

Mr. President, I digress from the quotation long enough to say that these great educators are unanswerably right. With 21 years of college teaching behind me, I say most respectfully that the bill which is sponsored by the Senator from Alabama, myself, and others, barely scratches the surface of America's educational needs of the moment. It does not come anywhere near meeting the real problem which threatens and confronts America in respect to improving education at the elementary and secondary school level.

Scholarships, desirable as they are, are not the whole answer even for the relatively few students who will benefit from them; and the scholarship students will make only a slight dent in America's educational problem. I believe in relying on the experts. I believe in following the experts in matters on which they can speak with authority. Here is the unanswerable testimony of experts. We find it in page after page of the printed hearings. I cite testimony such as the testimony I have just read. I read it again:

The quality and adequacy of college faculties and facilities are the essential determinative factors of the quality and quantity of our high trained leadership over the next decade, and indeed, will always be major factors.

I continue to read:

Our colleges and universities are now in great need of expanded financial support, so that they may attract and retain competent faculties, provide adequate facilities, and keep charges to students low enough that

they do not constitute an insuperable financial barrier to college attendance. One of the most dangerous tendencies in American higher education today in our opinion is the tendency to throw more and more of the cost of education on the students, and, of course, on their families. * * *

This is preliminary, Mr. Chairman, to saying that the members of our two associations are opposed to the inauguration of a Federal scholarship program at this time.

Senators should keep in mind that I am reading from the testimony submitted by great educators in behalf of the land grant colleges and State universities of America. There are land grant colleges in each of the States represented in the Senate.

When the land grant schools of the Nation takes this position, I submit that the Senate of the United States had better stop and take a long look at the pending bill. Our colleges and universities are telling us that it does not do the job. They are the people who know.

First, it would not meet the primary need, which is direct aid to colleges and universities, as I indicated above, for faculties and facilities.

The statements I have quoted from the hearings are from experts in the field of education. When the representatives of land grant colleges and State universities take this position, we can be certain that they are the persons who know. Listen to the words of the last quotation again:

First, it would not meet the primary need, which is direct aid to colleges and universities, as I indicated above, for faculties and facilities.

The additional reasons given dealt with the issue of whether the scholarships we provided would actually go to students who would not otherwise attend college. In presenting this statement, Dr. Caldwell of the University of Arkansas quoted the recommendations of the American Society for Engineering Education as follows:

The most critical shortage affecting engineering education at the university level is, and will be for the next decade, the shortage of engineering teachers. Of secondary, but critical, importance is the deficiency in laboratory, classroom, and office space. * * * Therefore, unless and until these critical shortages are relieved, programs which aim primarily at increasing the supply of undergraduate engineering students beyond those now in sight are highly questionable. On the other hand, programs to support improvement of their high school preparation in English, mathematics, science, language, and history are most important.

There are provisions in S. 4237 that would be of great help in improving the high school preparation of prospective engineering students.

But, Mr. President, listen to this educator. He said not one word about the need for scholarships. To the contrary, the testimony made it clear that the problem is not one of getting students; it is a problem of getting adequate teaching and adequate facilities. Those are the two primary needs, said this great educator.

One who points this out puts himself in the embarrassing position of seeming to be opposed to a bill before the Senate

which is good so far as it goes. I am not opposed to it. I am among its co-sponsors. I simply take the position that we should do first things first. This is not the first thing we should do. It is rather far down the list, when we consider the needs of American education.

So I urge that if we are to pass the bill—and I shall vote for the scholarships—then we ought to add to the scholarships a \$500 grant to the institution to which the student will go, so that the \$500 can be plowed into the facility needs of the institution; into the teacher needs of the institution, perhaps into the salary budget, to enable the institution to keep some teachers who otherwise would be drained off by industry, because industry is able to pay much higher salaries.

Among the recommendations of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges was this:

We believe that the times call for direct Federal aid in construction of college and university laboratory and classroom facilities, particularly in fields related to science and engineering.

In answer to questions from committee members, Dr. Caldwell made this statement:

The basic premise of this document is that we need improved faculties and facilities in order to do higher quality work in higher education. Putting more students in our hands does not per se do it. As a matter of fact, it puts more load on us. We would like to see more assistance in providing faculty and facilities for just the very purpose that you make here. * * * We say to you: The quality and adequacy of college faculties and facilities are the essential determinative factors of the quality and quantity of our highly trained leadership over the next decade. We are looking for both. This indeed has always been the major factor. The adequacy of faculty, we think, is the determining factor.

I say again to Senators, each one of whom has at least one of these institutions in his State, that this is the testimony of the representatives of those colleges concerning the issue before the Senate. My amendment seeks only to make some contribution to those institutions for faculty and facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Has all my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes.

Mr. MORSE. May I have 5 minutes on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I cannot yield; I have only 5 minutes.

In addition to the experts from the educational institutions who testified, our committee received statements from Senator CASE of New Jersey, Senator CLARK, and Senator HUMPHREY concerning the recognition that must be taken of the Federal responsibility in this area. These Senators all proposed various programs of direct aid to the States or to the institutions for improved facilities or faculties or both.

I made my own statement to this effect, and presented the picture that faces my State of Oregon, where enrollments are expected to increase by 58 percent in the next 4 years, irrespective of any Federal scholarship students.

But there is one more reference to the committee hearings I would like to make for the benefit of my colleagues. On page 251 there are set forth the figures showing the percentage of the cost of education that is covered by tuition. The figures from the Office of Education are as follows: For the academic year 1953-54, the most recent year for which complete and comparable institutional data are available, the income from student fees of the privately controlled higher institutions constituted approximately 50 percent of the total educational and general expenditures. In the case of the publicly controlled colleges and universities the comparable ratio was 14 percent.

Where we give the student a scholarship and thereby pay most or all of his tuition, we are only paying half the cost of educating him if he goes to a private school and only 14 percent of the cost if he goes to a public school, on the average.

The average tuition and fees in private institutions in 1957-58 was \$736; and the average tuition and fees in public institutions was \$168. Therefore, I believe a grant of \$500 to each institution for each scholarship student it enrolls is a reasonable rule of thumb to follow. It would still not cover the whole cost of education; but it would go a long way in that direction.

I offered my amendment in the subcommittee, and it was rejected, but not because all my colleagues on the committee disagreed with the principle of my amendment. It is fair to say that a number of my colleagues, including some who voted against my amendment, took the position that they felt the only thing we had any hope of having passed this year was a scholarship and loan bill without anything else attached to it. I stress that point.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have only limited time.

Mr. IVES. I point out only one thing. This proposal costs only \$5 million. That is a very small amount compared with the whole cost. I think the institutions are entitled to it.

Mr. MORSE. The senior Senator from New York has been a great friend to the educational institutions of the country. I am not surprised to have him give me this boost in the closing minute of my statement in support of my amendment.

I call attention to the fact that in S. 4237 we do provide a grant to the institutions for each fellowship student they enroll, a grant that may go as high as \$2,500. The principle of helping the institutions finance the education of scholarship students is just as valid, in my opinion.

My amendment points the way in which the American Nation will have to go in the years ahead. The longer we wait to do the job, the further ahead

of us the Soviet Union is going to get in the science and technology of war. I think it is that simple.

The pending bill does make important contributions to helping improve the supply of teachers. But there is no substitute for adequate salaries in obtaining and keeping good teachers at any level of education.

I favor S. 4237, and I shall vote for it. It is a step in the right direction. But it is only a token, and I shall continue working in the next Congress for the additional Federal program for education that is really needed.

I offer my amendment—and I do so good naturedly, probably hoping against hope—with a plea, yes, with a prayer on my lips that the Senate tonight will rise to its responsibility of being fair to the educational institutions of the country, and that when it passes the scholarship bill, it will also provide for the institutions to which the students will go a contribution which will help to defray a part of the additional burden which those institutions will have to assume in order to carry out the scholarship provisions of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield time to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I seek information: If the Federal Government is to provide the educational institutions with \$500 for each Federal scholarship student in attendance, separate and apart from the scholarship funds which are to be given to the students, I wonder whether such payments by the Federal Government could be made to, let us say, Wilmington College, a Quaker institution; to Wooster College, a Presbyterian institution; to Wesleyan College, a Methodist institution; to Carroll College, a Catholic institution; to Kenyon College, an Episcopalian institution; and to Dennison College, a Baptist institution; without violating the constitutional provision?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, certainly considerable time is needed to discuss this point. Let me say that in my opinion there is no constitutional barrier to the making of such payments. The bill already calls for them to be made to the institutions for each fellowship awarded for graduate study.

I wish the Senate were not now proceeding under a limitation of time, under the unanimous-consent agreement, because I should like to discuss this long-existing prejudice in the Nation which has no basis in constitutional law, namely, that the Federal Government is without power, under the Constitution, to appropriate funds for the education of the students who attend private schools.

As I stated earlier today, in connection with another amendment, such payments have previously been made in the United States, to the extent of great sums of money paid in connection with WPA and the PWA projects, in the case

of the funds for those agencies which were used to help improve educational facilities in the Nation. They have been made to nonpublic schools which are land-grant schools. They have been made to cover the cost of educating servicemen.

Let me restate very quickly my long-standing position which I have taken under considerable criticism in my State, although my State has threshed out, through the courts, the issue of whether tax dollars can be used for the benefit of the students who attend private educational institutions. The famous Oregon cases, which went all the way to the United States Supreme Court, established that point once and for all, in my opinion.

I realize that it can be said that those cases involved State tax funds, rather than Federal tax funds; but I point out that there is no justification for an attempt to draw a line of demarcation between such use of State tax funds and such use of Federal tax funds, insofar as the constitutional law on this point is concerned. The test is whether the benefit goes to the students concerned.

In connection with my amendment, it will be possible to trace directly to the students the benefits which thus will be received by the educational institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, I understand that it is the position of the Senator from Oregon that the proposed \$500 payment for each Federal scholarship student would not go directly to the college the student attended, but would be of benefit to the student himself, just as the scholarship subsidy the student received would be of direct benefit to him, not to the college he attended; and therefore such payments would come within the constitutional provision.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; even though the contribution goes to the educational institution, the court will always be able to pierce the veil and trace the benefit from it directly to the students concerned. In my opinion, that is all that is necessary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has clearly stated that his amendment does not involve payments to particular institutions, but, instead, involves payments for the benefit of the students who attend the institutions, as those payments would be made under a

formula established by the proposed Federal law.

In this instance, the proposed Federal scholarship will make it possible for such a student to choose a college which is qualified to meet the requirements of the scholarship he has received. On that basis, the student might attend a college which was not a public institution; and in such case, the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would require that the particular institution be permitted to receive, because of the attendance of national or Federal scholarship students, and receive in behalf of those students—additional funds, in order to be able to make available to them the necessary facilities.

Let me say that previously I introduced a bill on this subject; and I shall request that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

I certainly believe the Senator from Oregon is correct; and I wish to associate myself with his endeavor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield time to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I wish to express my complete agreement with the pertinent comment which was made a moment ago by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I desire to associate myself with his remarks, and also to indicate, for the benefit of my colleagues and for the benefit of the RECORD, my support of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, with which I am in hearty agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that there may be a quorum call, without having the time required therefor charged to the time available, under the unanimous-consent agreement, to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes in opposition to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HILL. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon has stated, this amendment was considered by the subcommittee, and voted down by the subcommittee. It was then considered by the full committee, and was voted down by the full committee. There were several reasons why the amendment was voted down by both the subcommittee and the full committee. One reason was that the amend-

ment would give \$500 to every college and every institution to which a boy or girl would go with a scholarship. A scholarship would go to the boy or girl, and then there would be a grant of \$500 to the college or institution.

The record shows it does not cost \$500 in many institutions for the education of a boy or girl for any particular year. Some of the costs were shown to be as low as \$225 a year, \$239 a year, and \$279 a year. So why should we give such institutions \$500 a year?

The Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, at its 71st annual convention last fall, declared in its resolution that "payments to institutions should cover only additional direct administrative costs incurred as the result of special services or reports involved in the Federal program."

The distinguished Senator from Oregon has quoted from the testimony of Dr. Caldwell, who once was head of one of our colleges in Alabama, and whom we in Alabama hold in the highest esteem. Dr. Caldwell declared that "all payments should be made to the individual students receiving the scholarship rather than to the institution except for sums necessary to meet the administrative cost to the college of any Federally required reports not required for the ordinary student."

Instead of this program costing \$5 million, it would have to bear the cost over 7 years, because a boy or a girl who received a scholarship in the fourth year would be allowed to continue the remaining 3 years. So the period would run for 7 years. Instead of costing \$5 million, the program would cost about \$135 million.

For those reasons, both the subcommittee and the full committee rejected the amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. When I referred to the figure of \$5 million, I was referring to \$5 million a year. I neglected to state the number of scholarships involved, which is 22,000 a year. When the years are added up, the time amounts to 7 years; but even then, the cost would be less than \$20 million for the 7 years, on the average.

Mr. HILL. So many students are admitted in 1 year. The 4-year period goes in effect. The same number are admitted the following year. It is only at the end of the 7th year that the program runs out, because there is a 4-year scholarship period included.

Mr. IVES. But if the amount of \$135 million is divided by 7, it comes to less than \$20 million a year.

Mr. HILL. That is true, but we are talking about the overall cost, which under the bill would be the sum of \$135 million.

Mr. IVES. That is what I am talking about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the position taken by the chairman of the committee. The question has been discussed fully. The proposal would result in an additional cost and would not accomplish what we are trying to do. So I wish to identify myself with the views of the chairman of the committee in opposing the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield one-half a minute to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield time on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for one-half a minute.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I have listened to the argument made by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. I am very much impressed with the validity of the argument he has made. I desire to associate myself with him in favor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 69, as follows:

YEAS—20

Carroll	Jackson	Mansfield
Case, N. J.	Javits	McNamara
Clark	Kefauver	Morse
Douglas	Kuchel	Neuberger
Fulbright	Langer	Pastore
Humphrey	Lausche	Proxmire
Ives	Magnuson	

NAYS—69

Aiken	Frear	Morton
Allott	Goldwater	Mundt
Anderson	Gore	Potter
Barrett	Green	Purtell
Beall	Hayden	Revercomb
Bennett	Hennings	Robertson
Bible	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bricker	Hill	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoblitzell	Schoeppel
Bush	Hruska	Smathers
Butler	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnson, S. C.	Sparkman
Carlson	Jordan	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Symington
Church	Kerr	Talmadge
Cooper	Knowland	Thurmond
Cotton	Long	Thye
Curtis	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ellender	McClellan	Yarborough
Ervin	Monroney	Young

NOT VOTING—7

Chavez	Holland	Payne
Dirksen	Murray	
Flanders	O'Mahoney	

So the amendment offered by Mr. MORSE for himself and other Senators was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from

Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral services of Congressman McVEY and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just received a note from the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who must leave by plane very shortly. He would like to speak for 5 minutes on the bill. Apparently he will be yielded that time. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, that the time of the Senator from New York will not be counted against me, and that my remarks will be printed in continuity in the RECORD without showing the interruption by the remarks of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have a matter which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate. It relates to the bill, but does not have any relation to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The language of the Senate bill differs from the language of the House bill. I have examined the bill very carefully with a view to ascertaining whether there was any likelihood of the administration of the loan provision or the administration of the scholarship provision or of the other features of the bill being intruded with any discrimination on the ground of race, creed, color, or national origin.

After examining the bill very carefully, I consulted with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which will administer the bill if it is enacted into law.

I should now like to read into the RECORD a letter which I believe very clearly covers the subject, and makes very plain that the program will be administered in the same spirit as the GI bill of rights program and other programs which represent expenditures of national funds, and therefore should have no trace whatever of discrimination connected with it. I read the letter, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, August 13, 1958.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This relates to the inquiry by a member of your staff regarding two provisions in H. R. 13247 (the proposed National Defense Education Act of 1958), as enacted by the House of Representatives.

The first provision in question is in section 205 (b), and relates to the proposed program for loans to students in institutions of higher education. It would provide that such a loan shall be made by the institution of higher education "without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. * * *

It is our belief that the quoted language is declaratory of the inherent meaning of other provisions of section 205. Subsection 205 (b) (1) specifies criteria of eligibility for student loans; namely, (a) that the student be in need of the amount of the loan, and (b) that he be capable of maintaining good standing at the institution of higher education he attends. Subsections 303 (a) (2) and (3) of the Senate bill (S. 4237) contain similar language with reference to need of financial assistance and additional language requiring that special consideration be given to students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign language, and who indicate an interest in teaching in elementary or secondary schools.

These provisions, in our opinion, would govern the determination of who are eligible students. Race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, or sex are not factors. Discrimination against eligible students on any such grounds would, therefore, be contrary to the above-mentioned provisions in the loan titles of each bill.

H. R. 13247 as it passed the House did not include a scholarship title. Such a title is, however, in the Senate bill, and we have had previous occasion to consider whether discrimination would be permissible in the selection of students for the award of scholarships. We concluded that the requirement for selection of individuals by the State commissions "in accordance with objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability to pursue successfully" the college course (with special consideration to those who have superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern foreign language) would preclude the use of unrelated selection measures and would, therefore, prevent discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, or sex. An antidiscrimination provision in the scholarship title would, therefore, provide no new protection.

The second antidiscrimination provision of H. R. 13247 as it passed the House is contained in section 503 (a) regarding the award of fellowships for graduate education. Both the House provisions and title VI of the Senate bill contemplate the award of such fellowships from among those accepted for study in approved graduate programs. These awards would be made by the Commissioner of Education of this Department. It seems clear to me that the awards of such fellowships would be the same without as with an antidiscrimination provision.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. President, it is very essential that this statement be made a part of the legislative record of the whole bill. I feel very deeply that every proponent of

the bill, regardless of what he might think about its details, desires that the program be administered in the spirit of complete nondiscrimination, as set forth in the letter.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 8-12-58-C, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$17,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000."

On page 10, line 5, strike out "\$500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$250."

On page 10, beginning with "Any" in line 6, strike out all through line 14.

On page 14, line 15, after the semicolon insert "and."

On page 14, line 22, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a period, and strike out all following such line through line 13 on page 15.

On page 18, line 9, after "Loans" insert "first preference with respect to \$750 of such loan (except as provided in clause (4) below) shall be given to persons holding National Defense Scholarships, and after such first preference."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Kentucky desire?

Mr. COOPER. Ten minutes.

Mr. President, my amendment is a simple one. I do not believe it will require extensive explanation. I have placed on the Senators' desks a brief explanation of the amendment.

My amendment refers to title 2 of the bill, which is called National Defense Scholarships. As background for my amendment, I make this statement:

The President recommended 10,000 scholarships a year, for 4 years, with individual grants up to a maximum of \$1,000 a year, wholly on the basis of need. His recommendation was that all advances should be grants, and all on the basis of need.

The Committee bill provides 20,000 scholarships a year for 4 years, with initial awards of \$500 a year, and additional grants up to a maximum of \$500 a year, if need can be established. An outright grant of \$500 is made at once. Then if the person selected for a scholarship can establish need for additional funds, additional funds may be granted up to \$500. The total amount which would be made available to a high school student selected for a scholarship to the maximum of \$1,000 a year would be in the nature of a grant.

The House eliminated the entire title. There is no provision for scholarships in the House bill.

While I was not on the subcommittee on education we did discuss this matter of scholarships in the full committee. Amendments were offered. I offered an amendment which is not quite like the one I am offering tonight I proposed in committee, that one half of the amount advanced a student be in the form of a loan.

I should like to explain what my amendment would do. The amendment would maintain the scholarship title. It would provide an award of \$250 a year, for each year the scholarship winner remained in college instead of the \$500 provided in the committee bill.

It also provides that if a student to whom a scholarship had been awarded could establish need for additional help, he can receive loans to a maximum of \$750 a year. My amendment would make available to a boy or girl selected for a scholarship the same amount of money provided in the committee bill—one thousand dollars—if need can be established. The grant would be \$250 instead of \$500, and the remainder up to \$1,000 would not be a grant, but a loan.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I wonder if the Senator would mind my suggesting another aspect of this proposal. Actually, under the bill, the total amount to which the winner of a scholarship award would be eligible is an outright grant of \$1,000, and not \$500. So it is \$250 against \$1,000.

Mr. COOPER. The committee bill provides for an immediate award of \$500.

Mr. IVES. That is correct; but it provides for an ultimate amount of \$1,000, if necessary, whereas this total is \$250 overall, plus a loan of \$750.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the Senator from New York has raised a question which might be pursued further. Under the committee bill which is before the Senate, there would be an outright grant of \$500; with the right to borrow \$500 more, making available a total of \$1,000.

Mr. COOPER. No; there would be the right to receive additional grants of \$500, if need could be established.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, it provides for grants of \$1,000.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is worse than I thought it was. But under the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky there would be a grant of \$250, and if the student needed funds he could borrow \$750, making \$1,000 available to each student who might receive a scholarship.

Mr. COOPER. The same amount would be available. The conditions of the loan are prescribed in title III.

The fiscal effect would be this: The committee bill provides for an initial authorization of \$17,500,000 for the first year, and then such sums as may be necessary for the succeeding years. If the figures are broken down they would indicate a total of 20,000 scholarships a year, or 80,000 for the 4-year periods. The grant of \$500 per scholarship would amount to \$2,000 for each student in 4 years, or \$40 million for each class of students. The total cost would be at least \$160 million; and if we follow the calculations which the Depart-

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare, evidently followed, assuming an appropriation of \$17,500,000 a year and scholarship grants averaging about \$750 per year, including the grants based on need, the projected cost of the committee bill would be \$240,000,000.

Following the same reasoning, the cost of my amendment would be less than half that figure or \$80 million. But cost is not the main issue on which I ask my amendment to be accepted by the Senate.

The reasoning favoring the scholarship provision is that it will encourage student to undertake scholastic achievement, and that it would help outstanding students who might not be able to obtain the funds to go to college. It is hoped also that the establishment of a scholarship program in a State, would stimulate high schools to revise their curricula—I hope they would—and return to the sciences, mathematics, and of the basic studies.

My amendment would achieve the same ends. The yearly award of \$250, a total of \$1,000 per student for 4 years in college, is an award for scholastic achievement. And if a student really wanted to go through to college, of course, there would be made available loans to an additional \$3,000 on easy terms, as will appear from a reading of the provisions of title 3.

My amendment would attract the more serious student, the one who wants to go to college and spend 4 years in study. My proposal would do everything that the committee had proposed to do, and at half the cost.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Can the Senator tell us whether the loan which would be provided under the terms of his amendment would be subject to forgiveness in the event a student went into the teaching profession?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I will allow myself 5 additional minutes.

The loan provisions of title III would apply to the amendment I have offered. Title III provides that a person receiving a loan may obtain forgiveness of the loan at the rate of 20 percent a year for each year served as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That would be provided, and it would apply to loans?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator inform us whether in the aggregate his amendment would increase or decrease the cost of title II of the bill; and, if so, by how much and in what way?

Mr. COOPER. The immediate reduction would be \$80 million for the scholarship grants. From that point on I cannot tell, because the remainder of the money would go to students in the

form of loans, instead of grants based on need. I cannot tell how much of it would be paid back and how much might be forgiven by reason of service as a teacher in an elementary or secondary school.

Mr. COTTON. The ultimate cost to the Government might be just as much?

Mr. COOPER. It could be.

Mr. COTTON. It could be?

Mr. COOPER. It could be if every student applied for and received an additional \$750 per year in loans, and did not repay it.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield. It is not likely that it would cost as much as the committee bill, for I am sure that a great part of the loans would be repaid.

Mr. MORTON. It could be as much only in the unlikely event that every student had to draw the whole \$750, that every one of them went into teaching, and that every one of them continued to teach for 5 years.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. It is unlikely all of the contingencies you mentioned would happen.

Mr. MORTON. Under any normal application of reason, it seems to me that the amendment would cut the cost virtually in half; certainly by 35 percent.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the cost would be cut as you say by at least 50 percent. How much, no one can say, but less than the committee bill.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is it not correct to say that this type of loan is generally the type of loan which is paid back? Generally speaking, in an educational loan there is no loss. People who borrow for their education are practically always sure to pay back their loans, unless death or some unusual circumstance intervenes. There are usually the best type of loans.

Mr. COOPER. Many colleges have revolving loan funds, and they maintain lending programs on the basis of the loans being repaid. The loans are repaid.

I close by saying I believe the amendment would achieve the same purposes as the committee amendment. In addition it would attract the serious students, students who are determined to go through college, and are willing to show their determination by borrowing part of the money, instead of accepting a full grant. It would save money for the Treasury. But I emphasize it would achieve the same objectives as the committee provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The House eliminated this entire title. It seems to me the Senator from Minnesota has a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. HILL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated. It is in the nature of a substitute for the Cooper amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$17,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$22,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Minnesota yield himself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished and able Senator from Kentucky is an effort not to limit the number of scholarships which are available under the terms of the pending bill, but to limit the extent of the grants for the scholarships, and, in so doing, to replace the amount of the grants by loan availability both in the instance of scholarships and in the instance of the money which is required on the basis of need.

The Senator from Kentucky, in his explanation sheet of the amendment, has noted that the bill provides 22,000 scholarships a year for four years, with awards of \$500 a year for each scholarship. The bill provides additional grants, up to a maximum of \$500, if need can be established. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would limit the amount of the award of the scholarship to \$250, and would authorize loans up to \$750 if need can be established. The loans under the Cooper amendment would be made in the same manner as provided in title III of the bill, which is the loan feature of the proposed National Defense Education Act.

Mr. President, we ought to face what we are confronted with. The other body struck out the section of the bill relating to scholarships. The House decided, in passing the so-called national scholarship bill, to eliminate the scholarship feature. It decided that it would place the entire assistance program for deserving students on the basis of loans, rather than on the basis of awards for excellence, awards for intellectual attainment, awards for competency in education, and awards for those who have demonstrated the God-given attribute of unusual intellectual talent.

I cannot for the life of me understand why Congress, which has been willing to appropriate approximately \$40 billion for the defense of the nation in terms of manpower and material, should quibble about a provision in a national defense education bill which would grant some money to deserving students, on the basis of national competition for national scholarships.

I shall explain the purpose of my amendment. It is my view, which is

supported by the testimony, that there is a real need in the United States for at least 40,000 scholarships a year. This was, in fact, the figure included in the bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and his cosponsors. The pending bill (S. 4327), when it was introduced earlier this year, provided for 40,000 scholarships. The year before that I introduced a bill providing for 40,000 scholarships. Why? Because the records of our educational institutions revealed that from 150,000 to 200,000 graduates of high schools, who were in the upper brackets of their classes in terms of intellectual and educational attainment, were not going to college. They were not going to college because of the lack of financial opportunities or financial resources.

We have eliminated the need-for-scholarships section. The bill as it was reported by the committee places the \$500 scholarship award entirely on the basis of merit and intellectual attainment. There is no element of need in that measure at all. The additional \$500 provided in the committee bill is to be disbursed if there is need, and the need can be demonstrated. Then the student who is awarded a national scholarship will be able to obtain \$1,000—\$500 as a scholarship award and \$500 as a grant on the basis of need. No one can know the number of students who will apply under the terms of the need provisions of the bill.

But let us face it: If the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is adopted, then the Senate conferees, when they go into conference with the conferees of the other body, will be confronted with the choice of no scholarships on the basis of awards or grants, as is provided in the House bill, or a scholarship program proposed by the Senate with a minimum of \$250 or a maximum of \$250 on the basis of an award for intellectual attainment.

Are Senators to say that a student who is able to meet the requirements which will be established under legislation for a national scholarship will be given the paltry sum of \$250? There are shoe companies in the United States which provide larger scholarships than that. I pay tribute to the McAn Shoe Co., which gives scholarships of \$1,000 each to students, and in some instances more. There are cigarette paper manufacturing companies in the United States which give scholarships of more than \$1,000 each to deserving students. If they are only a few scholarships, but they are excellent scholarships.

But the Congress of the United States, which is endeavoring to promote education, which is planning to reward intellectual attainment, which is going to challenge the Soviet Union, proposes to offer scholarships at bargain-counter, discount-house, back-alley prices at \$250 a year.

If we are to have an educational program in which there are to be scholarships, let us have some real scholarships. A scholarship is not a mere piece of paper. A scholarship is a financial reward made on the basis of merit and intellectual attainment. It is an indication on

the part of the Government of the United States that we are serious about providing educational opportunities for gifted young men and women.

My amendment provides that at least 30,000 scholarships, under the terms of the bill as reported by the committee, shall be provided. Very frankly, I say to my colleagues, if my amendment is not adopted, we will be compromising the scholarship program between 20,000 and zero when we go to conference. But with the Humphrey amendment, there will be a compromise between 30,000 and zero.

What is the total cost of the program? The total cost of the program about which we are speaking is \$22,500,000 under the terms of my amendment. That surely is not very much money. It is fair to say that some of the tests which are taking place of our nuclear weapons in the Pacific cost more than the total scholarship program proposed in any one year.

I gather that some think we are daring; that we are venturing forth into some uncharted area of human endeavor. They may carry severe restrictions which limit eligibility, but there is hardly a college in the land which has scholarships of less than \$250. We shall hardly be making a contribution to the national defense and welfare by offering such small scholarships.

I offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], not because I think the committee bill is not a good bill; I think it offers a good beginning. But I think the committee itself, in order to report the bill, had to compromise from the real educational requirements of the country.

My amendment provides for 30,000 scholarships, at a cost of \$22,500,000, as compared with \$17,500,000 in the committee bill, thus assisting a few more students in this great Nation in a period of expanding population, a few more deserving students the opportunity to become, so to speak, soldiers for peace in the front line of American democracy.

I point out that we are saying to deserving students, "If you can qualify under the rigid requirements of the proposal in the bill, you will get \$500 a year, and up to \$1,000 if you need it."

We know that even in the Armed Forces \$10,000 a year is required for the training of each man. But Congress is still fiddling around with an educational program and is talking about the defense of America in terms of \$250 a student.

Let me conclude my argument by quoting from the committee report. The report of the committee is in behalf of a figure of 23,000 scholarships, which the committee ultimately recommended, but the report justifies 40,000. I submit that the testimony before the committee justifies 40,000. I submit that the testimony of the military officers before the committee justifies at least 50,000.

I was never able to understand why the President asked for 10,000, because not a single one of his witnesses, except a Cabinet officer who came before the committee to back the administration,

ever said that 10,000 scholarships were adequate.

Dr. Detlev Bronk told the committee:

I would recommend that scholarships be used not as a means of financial support only * * * I would use a scholarship program for the raising of standards, for setting higher levels of achievement toward which to strive.

Dr. Bronk further said:

It is a prize awarded for achievement, for unusual excellence, and for unusual prominence.

I ask my colleagues, Is the best the Senate can do a prize of a mere \$250 a year to a deserving student for unusual achievement, for unusual prominence, for unusual excellence? Is that all?

There are hundreds of colleges in the United States which give football players and basketball players, for their unusual ability on the gridiron or the court, five times \$250 a year.

I submit that if this is an education bill to aid the national defense, we ought to consider it as a defense measure and not a consolation prize.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement on the entire matter of scholarships. I shall not take the time of my colleagues to read it. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY—THE NEED FOR FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS

I am for scholarships—for lots of them—and for scholarships based on intellectual merit. I would like to explain why.

I have read the debates on the companion bill to this measure that were held last week in the House, and I read with particular interest the various comments made with respect to the desirability or undesirability of a program of Federal scholarships awarded on the basis of merit alone. This is a subject which I find of particular interest and which I think deserves our most serious consideration.

Only once—and then only in passing—did any of the participants in the discussion held on the floor of the House mention the one factor which I consider a most important, a vitally important, reason for keeping scholarships in this bill and for awarding those scholarships on the basis of merit: Scholarships which will be evidence to the entire world that the Government of the United States respects the young mind that devotes itself to work and study and application; scholarships which, being granted on the basis of merit alone, will bring about that one change in attitude on the part of parents that more than anything else is needed to assure us that local school boards throughout the country will concentrate on seeing to it that the students in their schools will have the very best in educational opportunity that the local community can possibly afford. I am thinking of the effects which a scholarship program based on merit alone will have on the parents of America's youth—of how such a program will inevitably and quickly make parents throughout the country take a really hard look at the kind of education being offered in the schools which their particular children attend. For a scholarship program based on merit will do just that. And that more than anything else is what we need to revitalize our educational system and to guarantee that emphasis on quality education will be continuous.

Let's get down to cases. Let's forget the generalities. Let's see exactly what it will mean to the student and to his parents in any local community in the Nation if we pass this bill and include in it a sizable number of sizable scholarships awarded on the basis of merit alone.

First of all, no one questions the fact that it would be a terrific incentive to our brighter students in all our high schools if they were to be offered an opportunity to win an accolade and a substantial sum of money from the Government of these United States for outstanding scholarship. The child who all too often is made to feel queer and out of line if he studies math and plays chess, instead of studying rock and roll and playing the young tough, would find himself working in a new atmosphere and shoulder to shoulder with thousands of bright students in his State and Nation rather than alone.

Second, are there any parents of America who would not be proud—exceedingly proud—to have a son or daughter win the recognition of the Nation as being an outstanding young citizen who has willingly devoted his time and his talents to work which the Nation needs done for its defense? There is no question but that every parent would encourage his child to strive to win such honor and such national acclaim.

It is of the utmost importance to the Nation that we get the parents of America to pay constant attention to the quality of education being offered in their local schools. I am willing to wager without any hesitation at all that within a week after the first scholarships under such a program as this bill contemplates are awarded you would see such an upsurge of interest in our high schools on the part of parents as have never been dreamed possible. Once the results were announced and it was discovered—and I think this is what would be discovered—that most of the scholarships offered in any particular State had been won by students enrolled in a relatively small number of the high schools of that State, you can well imagine how quickly and how insistently parents who have children enrolled in other high schools would demand to know why the quality of work in their own high schools was lower than in the schools which produced the scholarship winners. They will want to know why—they will demand to know why—and they will have a real and compelling reason for seeing to it that the deficiencies thus uncovered are corrected.

Right now most of our parents perforce have to content themselves by taking a look at the school building. If the building looks fine they assume that the children attending courses in that building are getting a good education. With the awarding of scholarships such as are proposed in this bill they will have their first real way of finding out whether or not they are. They will have discovered that the quality of teachers is important, and they will have to start paying decent salaries to get quality. They will quickly learn that it doesn't matter how beautiful or how new the school building is, but rather how good the teachers are, how many books and how much equipment they have, what courses are offered and which, if any, their children are required to take. They'll get a real glimpse at just how much importance their particular community has placed on brains, and they'll begin to attach much more to it. But this will happen, only if these scholarships are awarded on the basis of merit and if the awards are really sizable, not less than \$500. For it is obvious that if we give scholarships on the basis of need only, or if we give scholarships that have no really meaningful relationship to the cost of a college education today, we will be offering no reason whatsoever for parents to take the kind of interest in the schools that I have been talking about and which we so fervently want them to take in those schools.

On the other hand, and when we consider the cost of a college education today, I think I can say that, without question, if we are to offer sizable scholarships in sizable amounts, better than 90 percent of the parents of high school students in this country will really sit up and take notice. Why? Because, gentlemen, the cost of sending one child—to say nothing of 2 or 3 at the same time—to college today comes as a terrific shock not just to America's poorer families but to families with incomes big enough to put them in the upper one-fifth of the population financially. Ask any of the young men who work in your offices and who are beginning to contemplate sending their children to college—men earning anywhere from \$6,000 to \$10,000 or \$13,000 a year. They are top earners amongst America's families. They will tell you that they and their neighbors are seriously worried about the changes they will have to make in their families' patterns of living when the time comes to send a youngster away to school. Not only are they concerned, but they are very greatly interested in any proposal which shows promise of easing this great strain on the family income. Were we to enact the kind of scholarship proposal I am talking about, these parents in upper income brackets, and, of course, parents in every income bracket lower, would show a real and responsible interest in the results. They would play a really active role in determining the type of high schools America would operate in the future.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. COOPER. Can the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota be offered in lieu of my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is in order as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, but is not in order as a complete substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, inasmuch as the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would simply change one figure set forth in the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it the ruling of the Chair that my amendment is in order as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then I so offer the amendment.

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, later, I shall again request the yeas and nays, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Let me say that I understand that in the meantime the Senator from Kentucky wishes to reply to the comment I have made.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to respond to the comment made by the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is time yielded to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, am not I entitled to have time in which to speak on the amendment which has been offered to my amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Kentucky wishes to speak in regard to the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota has offered to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then I am willing to yield time to the Senator from Kentucky. How much time does he wish to have yielded to him?

Mr. COOPER. Five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senate should understand that the effect of the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has submitted to my amendment is this: The Humphrey amendment would delete from the second line, on page 1 of my amendment, the figure "\$5,000,000," and would insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$22,500,000"; and that amount would be available for the first year.

I believe the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that his amendment would provide 100,000 new scholarships per year, if my proposal for an initial award of \$250 a year is maintained. Senators who vote to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to my amendment will vote for approximately 100,000 new scholarships a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not wish to have my amendment interpreted as providing for an annual payment of \$250 in the case of each scholarship. Instead, my amendment, if agreed to, would provide for scholarships of up to \$1,000 each; and my purpose in submitting the amendment is to provide for scholarships of \$1,000 each as provided in the committee bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my amendment specifically provides that the annual amount available for each scholarship grant will be \$250.

Therefore, Mr. President, I rise to a point of order, and request a ruling by the Chair as to whether I have correctly stated the effect of the Humphrey amendment to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the point of order is well taken, in that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota would change only the figure "\$5,000,000" in the second line on page 1 of the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my amendment calls for a change in the amount on page 9 of the bill, in line 15, where the figure "\$17,500,000" appears.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, in line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$17,500,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$22,500,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my amendment is offered in the nature of a substitute, on the basis of the change I propose in the figure which just now has been read by the clerk. My amendment would retain in the bill, as reported by the committee, the figure "\$500," on page 10, in line 5, which is the maximum amount assigned to scholarships based on merit alone.

The whole purpose of my amendment is not only to increase the amount of money available for scholarships, but also, I say most respectfully—because I sincerely disagree with the amount proposed by the Senator from Kentucky—to maintain the \$500 allowance for each scholarship based on merit, with an additional \$500 permitted on the base of need. That is why my amendment is submitted as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. COOPER. My amendment provides a total of \$5 million be authorized for the first year, and that a grant of \$250 annually be awarded for each scholarship, and that up to \$750 may be made available to students awarded scholarships, as a loan, in the nature of a loan. The total could be \$1,000 per year—the same as the committee amendment.

The Senator from Minnesota has submitted, as an amendment to my amendment, a proposal which he states is in the nature of a substitute. But it would only change the amount authorized for appropriation for the first year, \$5 million to \$22,500,000. I submit that the remainder of my amendment would not be affected by the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, and that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, would be limited by the remainder of my amendment.

Mr. President, I request a ruling—whether his amendment can be a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has already ruled on the point of order.

The provisions set forth on page 2 of the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would not be affected by the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. The first provision on page 2 of the Cooper amendment relates to page 10 of the bill; the last provision on page 2 of the Cooper amendment relates to the language appearing on page 18 of the bill.

The only part of the Cooper amendment which would be affected by the Humphrey amendment is the second line

on page 1. At that point in the Cooper amendment, the figure "\$5 million" would be stricken out by the Humphrey amendment, and the figure "\$22,500,000" would be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. COOPER. Then, Mr. President, the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would be to increase the number of scholarships from 20,000 to over 80,000 a year. I do not think the Senate would wish to have that done.

Mr. President, under my amendment, a student approved for a scholarship could receive the same amount of money he could receive under the bill reported by the committee. When the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] states that I am proposing to reduce the money available to a student and making it difficult to attend college, such a statement is in error, and does not recognize the purpose of my amendment. I repeat any student could receive a total of \$1,000 a year, or \$4,000 during a 4-year college course. During those 4 years, he would receive a grant of a total of \$1,000—on the basis of \$250 a year; and if he so desired, he could secure a loan, over the 4-year period, totaling \$3,000. The loan would run for 12 years, at easy interest rates and without security. But if the student enters the teaching profession, the loan would be forgiven, at the rate of 20 percent a year.

If a student has the desire to attend college and get an education, I know of no better way than under my amendment.

I believe that many students would much prefer to receive a grant of \$250 a year, and loans for the balance rather than to have their total expenses paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have not quite finished my statement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, the Senate knows that throughout my service in the Senate I have voted again and again for Federal aid to education; for aid to teachers, and for school construction. I have introduced bills to give Federal aid. In 1954, I was chairman of the subcommittee on education, and worked for and reported to the Senate a Federal aid bill.

Earlier today, I voted for the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] to provide Federal aid for school construction.

So I speak as a friend of improving the educational system of our country. But, I believe with all my heart that my amendment conforms more nearly to the spirit of the people of our country than does the committee's proposal.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the hour grows late. I know everyone is tired. Sometimes it is very difficult to legislate in such circumstances.

I should like to say something about the bill. I am afraid we are now in a quandry. We are pulling two ways in trying to accomplish the intention of the bill. We all know the House has taken out of its bill the scholarship provisions.

I am afraid our distinguished friend from Kentucky has misconceived the real purpose of the scholarship provision. If the scholarships are merely to send more young people to college, I say let us strike out title II of the bill, as the House did and leave only the loan title. But the purpose of the scholarship emphasis is this: Realizing many of our primary and secondary schools are much below their possibilities in the development of our youth, we must put some emphasis on tightening up the academic atmosphere of our high schools, and even of our primary schools.

If the Senate were to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, we would flood the country with many small, cheap scholarships, which would provide no drive, no incentive, and no honor to the students who received them. In fact, in my opinion, we would be much better advised, if it is necessary to make an adjustment in the cost of this title, to go the other way and cut the number of scholarships in half and double the amounts allowed for the scholarships, so that we would intensify and deepen the significance and the honor of the awards, and accordingly increase the interest in scholarship generally.

I am afraid if we adopted the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky we would cheapen the value of the national defense scholarships to the point where the significance of the scholarships would be nothing, minimal when they are intended to be a badge of honor and something to impel students to work harder, and to bring about more intensive study and tougher curriculums.

I say to my friend from Minnesota, with reference to the amendment he has proposed, that reasonable men can differ as to the amount which should be in the bill. The House has stricken the title from its bill. The figure arrived at by the committee was reached after many weeks and months of discussion and intense debate, not only in the subcommittee but in the full committee. I believe it represents an eminently reasonable judgment of the committee as to the amount and number of scholarships which should be provided, so as best to combine the maximum impact of the scholarship program and a reasonable cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wanted to say a few words on the subject. Both the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have offered amendments which are diametrically opposed. It illustrates what we were up against in the committee. Different ideas were expressed. The committee finally came to the conclusion that what is contained in the committee bill is the best solution.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for what he has said. He was one who felt we should have a larger amount for scholarships. He was willing to compromise, and agreed to the figures contained in the committee bill, which he is supporting.

I feel the Senate would be making a terrible mistake if, at this time of night, it tried to arrive at what is the best combination. It is a difficult question. The committee did the best it could after weeks of testimony, asking witnesses their opinions, and reaching the best judgment it could. To change at this time what the committee has arrived at as a solution seems to be a futile thing to do from the standpoint of getting legislation enacted promptly.

I urge that the Senate get to a vote, and I urge defeat of both the Cooper amendment and the Humphrey amendment, and that the Senate adhere to the decision of the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HILL. I wish to emphasize what has been said by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and the distinguished Senator from Colorado. This amendment or an amendment similar to it, was offered by the Senator from Kentucky in committee, and the committee rejected the amendment.

As the Senator from Colorado has stated, to cheapen the scholarships would be to defeat the very purpose of having scholarships. As Dr. DuBridge, who is president of California Institute of Technology, and one of the most eminent scientists and scientific leaders of the country, emphasized before our committee, not only should we have scholarships, but we should provide that they be in sufficient amount as to constitute an honor, and stimulate, and present a challenge to, the boys and girls, and to the parents of the boys and girls, and to the schools themselves, in order that better curriculums and better courses may be established, and in order that boys and girls may take more difficult courses in mathematics, science, and engineering, and better prepare themselves to serve our country and the defense of our country.

As the Senate knows, President Eisenhower did not limit his recommendation to a small amount like \$250. He stated that, where there was a need, the amount should go up to \$1,000.

I urge the Senate to vote down both of these amendments.

I understand why my distinguished friend from Minnesota offered his amendment. In offering the amendment, he was in line with my original thought in the matter. The bill I originally introduced for myself and 25 other Senators provided for 40,000 scholarships. After considering the matter, as the Senator from New Jersey has stated, the committee arrived at the provision now in the bill. We urge the Senate to stand by the committee's provision. Knowing that we have to deal with the House, do not tie the hands of the Senate conferees before they can even get to conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Humphrey amendment, and, as compared with the Cooper amendment, in favor of the Cooper amendment; but I primarily wish to address myself to the proposition of entering into the field of Federal scholarships for education.

I believe the present temper of the Senate is such that we shall probably destroy a landmark in American government in the final vote on this very bill, unless some opinions are changed. I believe we shall do it for false reasons, or at least for insufficient reasons.

I wish to point out those reasons, briefly. I believe this is one of the sputnik bills. It got off the ground when sputnik went into orbit. There was a great deal of talk and thought on the subject. Perhaps some Senators committed themselves to a bill without going far enough and considering just what it might mean.

I notice this bill is wrapped up with the words "National Defense." That expression is on every single page of this 59-page report. It is on the first page the second time. It is on page 7 at the top. Every time the title changes, it is in there—National Defense Student Loan Program; National Defense Act; National Defense Scholarships. Almost everything that has been before the Congress at this session has been wrapped up in these misleading words.

I have not had a chance to hear very much of the debate today, but I passed through in time to catch another familiar refrain this morning, "What is Russia going to do?" There is a fear of Russia.

Mr. President, it seems to me we are living too much in an atmosphere of fear as to what Russia is going to do. I have heard every briefing on the subject of what Russia is trying to do, beginning last December and continuing until yesterday. I have a fear of only one thing Russia may do, and that is that Russia may outwork us.

We talk about a National Defense Act. No one says anything about advocating a 40-hour week. No one says anything much about putting more spine and more grit into the backbones of our youth. Nothing is said about a more rigid line of training. We rush in again, as we do

every time, with a big bag of money. The debate is primarily as to how much money should be provided. The talk is of dollars and more dollars. This is another time we are attempting to solve a problem mainly and largely with money, and it is another time when I think money will fail.

If we really think Russia is going to jump up in a few years and overcome us, although we have 182 years of political freedom behind us, since the birth of our Nation, fortified by 1,000 years of free institutions prior to then, and fine traditions, culture and scientific achievements, and if we really believe these things have to be done because of what Russia may do, then I submit, Mr. President, we are already whipped to begin with.

I do not yield to anyone when it comes to being interested in education and the proper training of the youth of America, but I believe when we get into the field of Federal scholarships we are going to kill the heart and soul of the other kind of scholarships. I believe it will be like digging a well beside another well. One may dig a large well and a well which seems to be better, but it will dry up the original source. I think we are treading on the most dangerous kind of ground, without really considering the value of what we have, or the consequences of the action.

All day long we stayed in the Appropriations Committee yesterday and argued about the supplemental appropriation bill, which totaled \$3.8 billion, and then came to the floor. What was the argument about? The argument was about reducing taxes in the face of a known \$12 billion to \$14 billion deficit.

With all deference, many of those who are in favor of the highest figure in this bill were in favor of the highest reduction of taxes last night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate, but I simply state a warning. Those of us who have been wrestling with these figures in the Appropriations Committee are aware of the problem. Every program costs more and more and is growing larger all the time. Costs are going up while tax income is going down. There is not too much being done to try to remedy the situation.

We talk about leadership. We talk about being overcome by Russia. Let us concentrate on a few fundamentals. There will be plenty of time for Federal scholarships later.

Mr. President, I come from the State of Mississippi, and I am very proud of it. My State is sometimes pointed to as the one with the lowest individual income. I visited at my home college in Mississippi last March.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. There was one thing we were agreed on. I spoke on scholarships at the alumni meeting. All of us were agreed there is not a single worthy boy or girl in the State now who does not have a chance to get a higher education if he or she has a little grit and determination.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. If I have any time remaining, I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish to associate myself with the splendid and sound sentiments voiced by our distinguished colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. As a choice between evils, I support the Cooper amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my intention to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

It is my intention to withdraw my amendment because in a discussion with the Parliamentarian I have learned the only way we can have a vote on the Cooper amendment and the criteria to be established is for me to withdraw the amendment and then later to offer my amendment de novo at another time.

I offered my amendment for one purpose. There was no thought of in any way disparaging the committee bill. I offered my amendment to demonstrate to the Members of the Senate that in my mind a Federal scholarship of \$250 is an insult to the intellectual attainment of American students.

Mr. President, I do not judge my life by what Russia does. As an American I am not going to judge what we ought to do in this Congress by what Russia does. I would like to judge what we do by what we ought to do. There are many things which need to be done in America, even if there had never been a Communist. I, for one, am fed up to the gills with talk to the effect that we ought to do this or the Communists will get us.

We ought to educate the bright young men and women of our country as an investment in life. We ought to educate our bright students because God Almighty gave them brain power. We do not have enough gumption at times in America to give these young men and women the opportunity they need to use their brain power.

I hear much about fantastic sums of money. I say to Senators that my own University of Minnesota spends twice as much a year—that one university—as what is involved in the scholarship program under the amendment I have offered. The University of Minnesota is one of the greatest universities in the world. It is the second largest, and 1 of the top 10 in intellectual attainment, in the United States. We take a back seat to no one.

Mr. President, when I hear about the dangers of Federal scholarships, I should like to remind my colleagues, every one of them, of what they have been doing for years. We have been giving Federal scholarships to every young man who goes to the Military Academy at West Point, to the Naval Academy, to the Air Force Academy, or to the Coast Guard School or any other place we send them. And they are not \$250 scholarships. Their average cost is \$5,000 a year. All those young men do not become generals, either, many of them become engineers, go into accounting, or into some other line.

In addition, we have appropriated literally hundreds of millions of dollars for facilities for the Air Force Academy, the Naval Academy, and the Army Academy, which I encourage. I am not complaining; I merely want to set the Record straight.

I hear that somehow or other a Federal scholarship may be bad. If that is the case, may I say there are some very prominent men in America today who have enjoyed Federal scholarships? One can draw his own conclusions. They are not bad men.

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi is eminently correct when he says we ought not to be judging our actions on the basis of what Russia is doing or will do. America has the greatest educational system in the world, and I want it to be greater. I say that no Member of this body can really in his own heart justify taking 1, 2, or 3 years from a young man's life for service in the military forces—for plain old military duty—and then ignore that young man's brainpower. This country is not in trouble because of soft living; it is in trouble because of soft thinking. Literally thousands of students in America today are not being given the opportunity they need.

One can say if students had gumption or "get up and go" they would go to college. I can talk about that. Nobody paid my way through college. Perhaps I did not have much gumption or "get up and go," but I earned every day of it—every living last day of it. I did not have any scholarship, either. Perhaps I could not qualify. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, there are many universities in America today which are better universities because of Federal grants. There are many universities in America today which would not be universities without the Land-Grant College Act, the first great Federal grant for universities. The first great educational grant was the Northwest Ordinance.

I happen to think the Government of the United States is as good as the government of Minnesota. I happen to believe the Government of the United States, if it can take time from the lives of my sons—and I have three—is also entitled to give something to their education. What do Senators think of that? If the Government can put my sons in the Army, it can also, if they have the brainpower, help them go to college. I am talking about the right of our country to survive. If we are going to stack up

man for man and body for body against the Soviets, we are licked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 2 more minutes. I have had this in my craw for a long time, and it is about time I got it out.

I think this country has some sort of idea that all we need to beat the Soviets is more bombs and more trained troops. If that is all we need, we shall be licked. What we need more than anything else is more know-how, supported by faith in and understanding of the democratic processes in which we believe. We believe in individuality. An individuality which is ignorant or untrained is not much of an individuality. I want an American individualism that is the best God Almighty can provide, with man's ingenuity to embellish it. That is why I believe in a scholarship program.

In all frankness, the committee has reported a good bill, but the chairman of the committee has said tonight that the amendment which I offer, providing for 30,000 scholarships, is no radical venture. I predict that before long there will be many more than 30,000 scholarships. This is the beginning, and a good beginning. To cut back the number of scholarships or the grants in connection with scholarships would be to do the wrong thing at the right time.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment. I hope that the amendment offered by my friend from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], whom I admire as one of the great Members of this body, will be defeated. If it is, I shall support the committee bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota having been withdrawn, the question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McNamara
Allott	Green	Monroney
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Barrett	Hennings	Morton
Beall	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Hill	Neuberger
Bible	Hoblitzell	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Potter
Bridges	Humphrey	Proxmire
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Revercomb
Byrd	Javits	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Jordan	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Church	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Kerr	Sparkman
Cooper	Knowland	Stennis
Cotton	Kuchel	Symington
Curtis	Langer	Talmadge
Douglas	Lausche	Thurmond
Dworsnak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wiley
Ervin	Mansfield	Williams
Frear	Martin, Iowa	Yarborough
Fulbright	Martin, Pa.	Young
Goldwater	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. All time has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered—

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senate about to vote on the Cooper amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The question recurs on the Cooper amendment. All time has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Eastland	Mundt
Barrett	Ervin	Purtell
Beall	Frear	Revercomb
Bennett	Goldwater	Robertson
Bible	Hoblitzell	Russell
Bricker	Hruska	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Bush	Jenner	Stennis
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Talmadge
Byrd	Jordan	Thurmond
Carlson	Knowland	Watkins
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Wiley
Cooper	Malone	Williams
Cotton	Martin, Pa.	Young
Curtis	McClellan	
Dworsnak	Morton	

NAYS—42

Allott	Hickenlooper	McNamara
Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Capehart	Humphrey	Morse
Carroll	Jackson	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Church	Kefauver	Potter
Clark	Kennedy	Proxmire
Douglas	Kerr	Smathers
Ellender	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Gore	Long	Sparkman
Green	Magnuson	Symington
Hayden	Mansfield	Thye
Hennings	Martin, Iowa	Yarborough

NOT VOTING—8

Chavez	Holland	O'Mahoney
Dirksen	Javits	Payne
Flanders	Murray	

So Mr. COOPER's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral services of Congressman McVey.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference in London as Chairman of the

Economic Section of the General Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, line 17, after the second "of" it is proposed to insert "of Latin America."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on page 41, line 17 of the bill there are mentioned the languages which are to be taught in the language development title, which is title VIII. I understand that the languages of Latin America are not included. The predominant languages are Spanish and Portuguese. It seems to me, in the light of the recent visit of the Vice President—

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It seems to me, in the light of recent experiences of the Vice President in Latin America, a matter which I, living on the border, can assure the Senate stems to a great degree from our failure to learn a beautiful language, Spanish, my amendment should be adopted. I ask the distinguished chairman if he will accept the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HILL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 62, line 5, after the word "payments" it is proposed to strike out the words "under any scholarship, fellowship, or grant," and insert in lieu thereof the words "or loans."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, first of all I should like to congratulate the committee on the language on page 62 where, in carrying out the suggestions of the National Science Foundation, and in line with good American practice, the Senate is assured that students qualifying for the scholarships shall be good Americans

and not be people involved in Communist or any other subversive organizations.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I have discussed the situation with some legal experts. While there is some doubt among them that this language would provide the same protection for all titles of the bill, the chairman of the committee and I both feel that certainly that is the intention of the committee, and I believe the chairman of the committee is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator discussed his amendment with me. In my opinion it is a qualifying amendment. I know of no objection to it, and I will accept it.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HILL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section at the end of the bill providing as follows:

That the State of Indiana be excluded from the provisions of this act.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes. Then perhaps I shall have to yield myself more time, because I do not believe I can make Senators understand the purpose of my amendment in so short a time.

I spent between 45 and 50 minutes on the floor this afternoon explaining the position of the State of Indiana with respect to this matter. Indiana has gone to considerable trouble and expense to make a survey of its entire educational system. The report on the survey has been filed with this body. It has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In a State having a total population of 4½ million, of all the students who were examined in all the schools of Indiana, it was found that among those who could qualify, only 53 students needed help. The people of Indiana have already risen to that need by raising a scholarship fund to take care of those 53 students. In other words, we do not want Federal help, we do not need Federal help, and we know that Congress cannot afford to give us Federal help.

I do not want to take the time of the Senate at this late hour. My remarks were extended at great length this afternoon and by previous insertions in the RECORD. I am ready for a vote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would it be germane to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana by adding the following sentence—

Mr. JENNER. To include Oregon? That will be all right.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The sentence is: "Nor shall any farm subsidy be paid to any resident of the State of Indiana."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would not be germane.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. (Putting the question.) In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it.

Mr. JENNER. The Chair is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I offer amendments which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "each fiscal year, beginning with"; and after the second comma on line 22, insert "and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years the sum of."

On page 52, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

(3) That funds appropriated under section 301 of this title shall be used exclusively for the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians or semiprofessional personnel in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields necessary for the national defense.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes; I hope I will not need all of it.

My amendments are intended to bring title X into conformity with the other titles of S. 4237, and to restrict title X to the purposes stated in the report.

The amendment would, first, limit to 4 years the authorizations for appropriations for the new area vocational educational programs which would be established by title X; second, provide that funds authorized to be appropriated for such programs shall be used exclusively for the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians or semiprofessional personnel in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields related to the national defense.

It seems to me that when we start a new program like this, it should be limited. I have discussed the first part of the amendment with the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I do not believe they have any objection to the amendments.

I hope the Senate will accept the amendments, because we do not know how the program will work. It seems to me that since the program is experimental, it should have a limitation, and the limitation of 4 years is a reasonable one.

The second part of the amendment simply seeks to point up in the bill what the committee says it wants to do in the way of training personnel in the fields which are necessary for the national defense. I could elaborate on that subject, but the hour is late. I simply emphasize that the amendments are not in conflict with the committee report but are actually in support of the committee report.

The bill ought not to be vague. If money is to be appropriated for this particular program, it should be pinpointed for the purposes intended, and made secure for the purposes for which the committee report intends it to be used.

I hope the Senate will agree to the amendments.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have discussed these amendments with the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey, the ranking minority member of the committee. We will take the amendments to conference.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 23, after the period, add the following:

For the purposes of title IV, the term "secondary school" may include a junior college, as determined by State law.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

My amendment will allow States, such as California and Michigan, and other States, which have private junior colleges to receive assistance under title IV. A junior college, in many cases, is nothing more than an extension of a secondary school. The assistance will be for the purpose of obtaining equipment, whether it be for science, mathematics, or foreign languages. The money would be made available according to a State plan administered by a State school official.

My amendment would make the minimum allowance available to junior colleges. It would not take anything away from the States. If a State so desired, it could take advantage of the plan. That would be within the discretion of the State.

I hope the chairman of the committee will agree to take the amendment to conference. The amendment was offered in the House when the bill was considered there and was adopted by the House.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator state again where his amendment applies?

Mr. POTTER. My amendment changes the definition on page 8, line 23. It reads as follows:

For the purposes of title IV, the term secondary school may include a junior college, as determined by State law.

Mr. HILL. I do not know why junior colleges should be included any more than other colleges. If junior colleges are to be included, I do not know where to draw the line between a junior college and a senior college. Colleges are not included in the bill now.

Mr. POTTER. In many States, as the Senator well knows, a junior college is nothing more, really, than an extension of secondary education. A State does not have to include them unless it so desires.

If a State so desires to spread the money in such a way as to include the junior colleges, I believe it should have the right to do so.

Mr. HILL. So far as a scholarship winner was concerned, he could attend a junior college if he selected it. But I do not know why we should select junior colleges in contradistinction to other colleges, and should provide that the junior colleges should receive the grants now provided for the secondary and elementary schools.

Mr. POTTER. I know that in many cases—I know it is true in my State—a junior college is really an extension of a secondary school, and in many cases the junior college and the secondary school use the same facilities. The exact arrangement depends in the State plans. There has to be an allotment for each State. States which do not care to do so would not have to do so. But I know that in some States the junior college is really a part of the preparatory program for the Senior college.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to do anything I can to be helpful to my friend, the Senator from Michigan. But I believe we would be doing violence to the bill if we included in it a provision that the junior colleges would receive benefits which would not be received by senior colleges. In fact, in some States the junior colleges are tied in with the senior colleges.

So I do not know why in the pending bill we should provide that the junior colleges should receive grants which would be denied to other colleges.

Mr. POTTER. Of course, the Senator from Alabama realizes that this provision was included in the bill which was passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HILL. That may be true; but we must vote on the merits of these matters, as they appeal to us.

I do not believe we would be justified in providing that junior colleges would receive special treatment which would not be received by other colleges.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the Senator from Michigan considered having this provision apply to junior colleges up to the 12th grade? In other words, they would not be excluded, as junior colleges, up to what would normally be the secondary school level.

Mr. HILL. Under the definition, the junior colleges are included, through the

12th grade, regardless of whether the institution calls itself a high school or junior college. However the institution denominates itself, it would be included, up through the 12th grade, but not beyond the 12th grade.

Mr. POTTER. Even though it called itself a junior college?

Mr. HILL. Such institutions are not included beyond the 12th grade, regardless of what they call themselves.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But I believe it important that we establish the legislative history in connection with this matter. I understand that it is the opinion of the chairman of the committee that even though the institution might be a junior college, it would be included, up through the 12th grade.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan is withdrawn.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, beginning with line 1, it is proposed to strike out all through line 2, on page 41.

It is proposed to strike out references to title VII and sections therein in the bill, and to renumber titles and sections of the bill as needed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Arizona yield to himself?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I realize that the hour is late, and that my colleagues are anxious to go to their homes. However, I would remind them that the Senate is on the brink of taking a very dangerous step in American history; and I, for one, do not intend to hurry homeward before my tasks are completed.

My amendment would strike out title VII of the bill; it is the title which would provide Federal grants to State educational agencies to assist them to establish and maintain programs of testing and guidance and counseling.

These days, the term "testing" covers a great deal more than simple tests of knowledge of reading, writing, arithmetic, English, history, and science. It includes I. Q. tests, personality check lists, problem check lists, psychological aptitude tests of all sorts and descriptions.

Most of these tests are given in an atmosphere of secrecy or semisecrecy. Neither the children nor their parents are permitted to know the scorings. Children are often admonished not to tell their parents the questions asked. The test publishers sell the tests only to schools or other institutions—never to laymen.

It has occurred to me, however, that if we are to authorize the appropriation of the taxpayers' money for these tests, we have the right—even the duty—to find out what sort of tests they are.

I hold in my hand a test which is published by one of the more popular test-makers, the Science Research Associates. The test is entitled "Science Research Associates, Junior Inventory—Form A."

The child is told to mark each one of the statements which sets forth what constitutes a problem to him or to her.

I may say that my staff obtained the document, despite the opposition of the educational branch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I shall read some of the significant items. On page 1 appears the heading "My Health."

I read some of the items which appear under the heading:

1. I wish I didn't have pimples on my face.
2. Sometimes it hurts when I breathe.
16. I have a thumping in my chest.
17. My stomach hurts a lot.
22. I can't hold onto my pencil.
24. My hand shakes too much.
25. Sometimes I get real dizzy.
28. I have to pick my nose a lot.
29. I sneeze a lot.
30. My skin itches.
35. I have no "pep."
39. I don't like to eat.
43. I am too thin.
45. Sometimes I wet my bed.

Under the heading "Getting Along With Other People," we find the following, among others:

46. I need more friends.
47. I can't make friends with very many kids.
49. I don't like people.
50. People don't like me very much.
57. I'm afraid of people.
59. People think I'm a sissy.
68. The girls don't like to play with me.
69. The boys don't like to play with me.
70. I'd rather play with little kids.
77. I wish people would leave me alone.
78. Nobody likes me.
79. People hurt my feelings.
80. I don't know how to act at a party.
83. I can't work with people.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is a test of the type which we would have given to the brilliant students of the Nation, in order to determine at an early age which ones would ultimately receive grants by way of Federal scholarships.

I read further from the test:

84. I don't know how to talk to people.
85. I don't know why people get mad at me.
87. I'd like to know more about girls.

Under the heading "About Me and My School," we find the following, among others:

89. I don't like school.
90. I don't like schoolbooks.
95. I don't like history.
96. I don't like geography.
97. I don't like social studies.
102. I don't see why I have to go to school.
118. I'm afraid of tests.
121. I don't like teachers.
129. I'm afraid of teachers.
131. I'd like to quit school now.
132. My schoolwork is too easy.

Under the heading "About Myself," we find the following, among others:

123. I am not nice looking.
134. I bite my fingernails too much.

137. I feel bad about things I do.
138. I tell too many lies.
139. I feel mad most of the time.
140. I am afraid my mother or daddy might die.
141. Sometimes I wish I was dead.
142. Sometimes I have to steal things.
146. I want to be good, and I can't.
147. I don't know what is wrong with me.
149. I worry too much.
150. I'd like to be a boy.
151. I'd like to be a girl.
153. I'd like more clothes.
160. I'm afraid of the doctor.
162. I'm afraid of the dark.
163. I'm afraid to be home alone at night.
165. I am too nervous.
168. I am too bashful.
170. I am too careless.
172. I am too crabby.
173. I can't go to sleep at night.
174. I have bad dreams.
177. I don't have enough money.

Under the heading "About Me and My Home," we find the following, among others.

178. I wish we had more money.
183. I wish I could go to more movies.
184. I don't have enough things to play with.
185. I wish we had a nice house.
186. I don't like my home.
187. I wish my daddy was home more.
188. I wish my mother would come back.
191. I wish I didn't have a brother.
192. I wish I didn't have a sister.
195. My mother is too bossy.
196. My daddy is too bossy.
199. I don't like my brother.
201. I wish my mother liked me more.
203. My mother and daddy often fight.
204. My mother treats me like a little kid.
205. My daddy treats me like a little kid.
207. My daddy won't help me.
208. I don't like babies.
215. I am afraid of my mother.
216. I am afraid of my daddy.
222. My home is too dirty.
223. I have to do too much work at home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire list printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY HEALTH

1. I wish I didn't have pimples on my face.
2. Sometimes it hurts when I breathe.
3. I get out of breath when I run or play.
4. I cough a lot in the morning.
5. My feet hurt when I play.
6. My feet hurt all the time.
7. I have sores between my toes.
8. My eyes itch.
9. My eyes hurt a lot.
10. Sometimes my ears hurt.
11. My nose bleeds a lot.
12. My teeth hurt.
13. My head hurts a lot.
14. My throat hurts a lot.
15. My chest hurts.
16. I have a thumping in my chest.
17. My stomach hurts a lot.
18. My back hurts.
19. My arms hurt a lot.
20. My hand hurts a lot.
21. My fingers hurt.
22. I can't hold on to my pencil.
23. My legs hurt a lot.
24. My hand shakes too much.
25. Sometimes I get real dizzy.
26. I get tired of sitting.
27. I have little sores on my skin.
28. I have to pick my nose a lot.
29. I sneeze a lot.
30. My skin itches.
31. It hurts when I go to the toilet.
32. I'm sick a lot.
33. I have a lot of colds.

34. I "throw up" a lot.
35. I have no "pep."
36. I can't hear very well.
37. I can't see very well.
38. I am hungry a lot.
39. I don't like to eat.
40. I am always so sleepy.
41. I am not strong enough.
42. I am too fat.
43. I am too thin.
44. My glasses make my eyes hurt.
45. Sometimes I wet my bed.

GETTING ALONG WITH OTHER PEOPLE

46. I need fore friends.
47. I can't make friends with very many kids.
48. I can't run as fast as the other kids.
49. I don't like people.
50. People don't like me very much.
51. People are too bossy.
52. People treat me like a little kid.
53. People make fun of me.
54. People won't answer my questions.
55. People don't think I'm ever right.
56. People won't help me.
57. I'm afraid of people.
58. People think I'm "spoiled."
59. People think I'm a sissy.
60. People think I'm too loud.
61. People think I'm too crabby.
62. I fight too much.
63. I always say the wrong thing at the wrong time.
64. The kids call me names.
65. The kids pick on me.
66. The kids chase me home.
67. The kids won't play with me.
68. The girls don't like to play with me.
69. The boys don't like to play with me.
70. I'd rather play with little kids.
71. The kids think I'm too smart.
72. The kids laugh at me.
73. I'm afraid to talk to people.
74. I'd like to have at least one good friend.
75. People don't like my friends.
76. I'd like to learn how to dance.
77. I wish people would leave me alone.
78. Nobody likes me.
79. People hurt my feelings.
80. I don't know how to act at a party.
81. I don't like the girls.
82. I don't like the boys.
83. I can't work with people.
84. I don't know how to talk to people.
85. I don't know why people get mad at me.

86. I'd like to know more about boys.
87. I'd like to know more about girls.
88. I'm not invited to parties.

ABOUT ME AND MY SCHOOL

89. I don't like school.
90. I don't like our schoolbooks.
91. I don't like arithmetic.
92. I don't like spelling.
93. I don't like reading.
94. I don't like writing.
95. I don't like history.
96. I don't like geography.
97. I don't like social studies.
98. I don't like gym.
99. I don't like music.
100. I don't like art.
101. I don't get good grades in school.
102. I don't see why I have to go to school.
103. I can't remember my schoolwork.
104. I'd like to find some good books to read.
105. I'd like to join a club in school.
106. I'd like to have a garden at school.
107. I'd like to paint more in school.
108. I'd like to have more music in school.
109. I'd like to do more things in school.
110. Our schoolroom gets too hot.
111. Our schoolroom gets too cold.
112. Our schoolroom is too dark.
113. Our schoolroom is too dirty.
114. I can't read very well.
115. I can't write very well.
116. I can't spell very well.
117. I can't do arithmetic very well.
118. I'm afraid of tests.

119. I always get in trouble in school.
120. I'm not smart enough.
121. I don't like teachers.
122. Teachers pick on me.
123. Teachers make fun of me.
124. Teachers won't answer my questions.
125. Teachers use words I don't know.
126. Teachers don't help me.
127. Teachers don't like me.
128. Teachers are too bossy.
129. I'm afraid of teachers.
130. I don't have any fun in school.
131. I'd like to quit school now.
132. My schoolwork is too easy.

ABOUT MYSELF

133. I am not nice looking.
 134. I bite my fingernails too much.
 135. I'm afraid someone will hit me.
 136. I can't do anything right.
 137. I feel bad about things I do.
 138. I tell too many lies.
 139. I feel mad most of the time.
 140. I'm afraid my mother or daddy might die.
 141. Sometimes I wish I was dead.
 142. Sometimes I have to steal things.
 143. I swear too much.
 144. I get mad too much.
 145. I do things I shouldn't do.
 146. I want to be good and I can't.
 147. I don't know what is wrong with me.
 148. I don't have much fun.
 149. I worry too much.
 150. I'd like to be a boy.
 151. I like to be a girl.
 152. I can't talk very well.
 153. I'd like more clothes.
 154. I'd like a pet animal.
 155. I'm afraid of animals.
 156. I wish I could do more things by myself.
 157. I'd like to get a job.
 158. I wish I was good in games.
 159. I'm afraid of loud noises.
 160. I'm afraid of the doctor.
 161. I'm afraid of the dentist.
 162. I'm afraid of the dark.
 163. I'm afraid to be home alone at night.
 164. I'd like to know what I'm going to be when I grow up.
 165. I am too nervous.
 166. I am too short.
 167. I am too tall.
 168. I am too bashful.
 169. I am too loud.
 170. I am too careless.
 171. I am too bossy.
 172. I am too crabby.
 173. I can't go to sleep at night.
 174. I have bad dreams.
 175. I talk too much.
 176. I can't sit still.
 177. I don't have enough money.
- #### ABOUT ME AND MY HOME
178. I wish we had more money.
 179. I'd like to have my own room.
 180. I don't like to take music lessons.
 181. I don't like to rest when the other kids are playing.
 182. I wish I could take music lessons.
 183. I wish I could go to more movies.
 184. I don't have enough things to play with.
 185. I wish we had a nice house.
 186. I don't like my home.
 187. I wish my daddy was home more.
 188. I wish my mother would come back.
 189. I'd like to have a brother or sister.
 190. I don't like my clothes.
 191. I wish I didn't have a brother.
 192. I wish I didn't have a sister.
 193. I wish my daddy would play with me more.
 194. I wish my mother would play with me more.
 195. My mother is too bossy.
 196. My daddy is too bossy.
 197. My brother is too bossy.
 198. My sister is too bossy.
 199. I don't like my brother.
 200. I don't like my sister.

201. I wish my mother liked me more.
202. I wish my daddy liked me more.
203. My mother and daddy often fight.
204. My mother treats me like a little kid.
205. My daddy treats me like a little kid.
206. My mother won't help me.
207. My daddy won't help me.
208. I don't like babies.
209. My mother makes fun of me.
210. My daddy makes fun of me.
211. My mother doesn't think I'm ever right.
212. My daddy doesn't think I'm ever right.
213. My mother won't answer my questions.
214. My daddy won't answer my questions.
215. I'm afraid of my mother.
216. I'm afraid of my daddy.
217. I'm afraid of my sister.
218. I'm afraid of my brother.
219. My home gets too hot.
220. My home gets too cold.
221. My home is too dark.
222. My home is too dirty.
223. I have to do too much work at home.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the persons who prepare the tests evidently do not think too highly of American education, to begin with, because they include in the test a list of words which they believe young people have difficulty with. Among the words thus listed are "bashful"—certainly a difficult word.

Other words included in the list are "bossy, breathe, crabby, dizzy, pep, pimples, sores, and stomach."

Those are the words which this organization thinks brilliant American children have trouble with, or have to be told the meaning of, before they will be able to take the tests.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall support the amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from Arizona.

I do not expect to vote for the bill, because I believe it would remove education from the hands of the parents.

I should like to call attention to an article published in Human Events for June 16, 1958:

Archbishop O'Hara, in an address to the National Catholic Education Association, April 8, said: "I am afraid that sometimes some of our teachers overlook the fact that the philosophy of secularist counseling is based on the exclusion of God and the soul from the educational process. I mention this because counseling is the subject of a piece of legislation now before the Congress. A bill presented at this session proposes Federal subsidies for enlarged counseling service available to students in both public and nonpublic schools, its purpose being the discovery of latent talent that could profit by college education."

This publication also quotes the Reverend Robert G. Forbes, Congregational minister in Washington:

Proponents of H. R. 12630 are surely to be found in the company of those disciples of John Dewey and Sigmund Freud who managed to ban from public schools the reading of the Bible and the Ten Commandments.

Having spent many years as a military chaplain, I can say that I have dealt successfully with counseling situations only when I managed to relate the individual's problems to a belief in God and moral values.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Usually one says, "You took the words right out of my mouth," but the Senator from Nebraska took the slip right off my page, so I will destroy it.

I want to continue with a few quotations from other samplings of statements found in other publications.

This is from the Science Research Association Youth Inventory, as quoted in the Los Angeles Times of May 26, 1958:

80. I have thought of suicide.
89. People dislike my race or nationality.
93. I have a crush on an older person.
155. I am not attractive to the other sex.
173. I don't feel I belong in the family.
187. I wish my father had a higher-level job.
188. I'm sometimes ashamed of my family.
203. I wonder if I am normal in my sex development.
212. Should I be bothered by dirty stories and vulgar talk?
213. My family avoids discussing sex with me.
277. How far should high-school students go in love relations?
230. I have conflicting information about sexual matters.
231. I want to know about venereal disease.
236. What can I do about body odor?
238. I smoke too much.
240. I have trouble with my menstrual period.
258. I want to get rid of pimples.
285. I am losing faith in religion.
293. Is it wrong to deny the existence of God?
291. Does it really pay to be honest?

The "Mooney Problem Check," as quoted by the same newspaper, contains the following statements and questions, and again I shall not read them all:

- No one to tell my troubles to.
- Wanted to know more about boys.
- Swearing and dirty stories.
- Family quarrels.
- Wanting to know more about girls.
- Wanting to run away from home.
- Wanting to know more about marriage.
- Should I neck, to be popular?
- Should high-school student pet and make love?
- Wan't things my parents can't give me.
- Wanting to improve my figure.
- My parents are too strict.
- I am sometimes ashamed of my family.
- I feel there is a barrier between myself and parents.
- My allowance is too small.
- My parents don't respect my opinions.

Mr. President, I have read many questions and statements, but I have not read anything which might influence me, if I were a commissioner of education, to pick out one student over another student and say that he was deserving of money from the Federal Government for the purpose of a scholarship. In fact, I would go to the houses of the children and talk to the parents, because with them may lie the fault not the State or the Federal Government as yet.

It is hardly surprising that many parents—when they do find out about these tests—complain that they tend to undermine belief in God, respect for parents and even the self-respect of the individual child.

It is more surprising, but certainly highly significant, that the test makers themselves are at loggerheads as to the validity of one another's tests. Even Mr.

John R. Ludington of the Office of Education concedes:

There are, to be sure, instances when individual measures on a single test might not be reliable. * * * The advantage, I think, is in having a series of tests or a battery of tests rather than reliance upon a single test.¹

However, Prof. Donald E. Super, of Teachers College, Columbia University, in a study of Multifactor Tests in Guidance, published in Personnel Guidance Journal, points out:

A dim view of multifactor test batteries is taken by Cronbach in the 1956 issues of Annual Review of Psychology. Cronbach goes on to cite the withdrawal of the American Council on Education Psychological Examination from the market, and its replacement by a measure of verbal and quantitative achievement (the Cooperative School and College Ability Test), as further evidence of the dubious status of differential aptitude testing.

After reviewing a number of papers by prominent test makers, Dr. Super gives his unqualified approval to only one battery of tests as valid for use in the high schools at this time.

There is nothing in this bill to assure that only this one battery may be used—assuming Professor Super to be correct in his appraisal. Hundreds and hundreds of different tests are currently in use, all recommended by their respective makers and all under intellectual attack by some other expert.

I can recall this particular instance very well. It is quoted in Sorokin's Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology and Related Sciences. I am sure some of my colleagues from the Far West remember back to the time when Professor Terman sifted a school population of a quarter million in order to identify and study a thousand or more with the highest I. Q. In 1935, 25 years later, he tested the group he had selected, 1,070 schoolchildren. Here is what he found. This is interesting. I call the attention of my colleagues to it, because it points up one of the broad steps to the stupidity we are achieving tonight in trying to say the Federal Government can take over not only the functions of the schools, but also the functions of the families:

Twenty-five years later, at the mean age of 35, the 1,070 schoolchildren, selected by a battery of the best intelligence tests available, and certified by the tests as being the most gifted among some 250,000 schoolchildren in California, have not demonstrated any notable superiority over a typical sampling of children of the professional, semiprofessional, and business classes from which 81.4 percent of them came.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I think that is condemnation enough of the idea that the Federal Government should now begin to finance these tests which, year after year, professor after professor, college after college, have passed on as being inconclusive.

¹ House hearings, part II, p. 773.

If the Senators doubt the extent to which this \$150 million is going to be subjected to Federal scrutiny, let him read what has to be complied with when the State draws up these measures.

If the Federal Government is going to say to the families of America that we now have to guide and counsel the children of America as to what is the best courses for them to take in college and what should be their best pursuit in life, I think we have really tossed in the sponge.

I do not want the Federal Government counseling my children. I do not want my own State counseling my children. That is the job of American parents and American churches. Have we gone so far down the ladder on rubbery legs that we are frightened to death by Russia and must say to the parents of the country, "Do not bother with your children. We are going to take them over. We will tell them what to study and what we want them to do, and how to do it. You keep on drinking your beer and watching television"? If so, this country is going to pot in a Cadillac, and not in a chariot, as happened in the days of Rome.

It seems to me, Mr. President, until the testing experts can get together on what tests are valid and what are not, we would be unwise to vote Federal funds to further psychological experimentation with the minds of the Nation's youths. I therefore offer my amendment to strike title VII from the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think my distinguished and beloved friend from Arizona has completely missed the purpose of this title. It was put in the bill because of the President's recommendation and his desire to identify aptitudes. Title VII reads, "Guidance, Counseling, and Testing; Identification and Encouragement of Able Students."

Let me read what the President stated in his message transmitting his recommendations relative to our educational system on January 27, 1958:

High-quality professional personnel in science, engineering, teaching, languages, and other critical fields are necessary to our national security effort. Each year, nevertheless, many young people drop out of high school before graduation. Many able high-school graduates do not go on to college. This represents a waste of needed talent. Much of this waste could be avoided if the aptitudes of these young people were identified and they were encouraged toward the fullest development of their abilities.

The administration proposes, therefore, that the Congress authorize—

(a) Matching grants to the States to encourage improved State and local testing programs to identify the potential abilities of students at an early stage in their education.

(b) Matching grants to the States to encourage the strengthening of local counseling and guidance services, so that more able students will be encouraged to stay in high

school, to put more effort into their academic work, and to prepare for higher education. The program also would provide for grants of funds to colleges and universities to permit them to establish training institutes to improve the qualifications of counseling and guidance personnel.

I simply cannot understand the distinguished Senator's argument or the questions he raises, which seem to have nothing to do with the matter at all. What we are trying to do is to identify the able students. That is the recommendation of the President. One of the purposes of the bill I introduced was to endeavor to accomplish the President's recommendations, as contained in title VII. It is for us to decide whether the President was correct. We must realize the need to seek the best talent in the country.

I have been in the education field. The greatest pleasure I had in education was to talk to the young men and women who wanted advice from older people as to the best course to follow to become this or that. Why should we not have people to advise these young men and women? I think it would be intelligent and cooperative to do so, and it is a reasonable function in the education process.

That is all I have to say. It seems to me we have to choose what is in the bill and in the President's recommendation. That seems to me to be a logical course if we are really going to step up our educational process. The best qualified young men and women should be obtained from the high schools, for training in science, if they are able, willing, and eager to take on a profession which will lead to progress in our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true, so far as testing is concerned, that the testing is entirely in the hands of the State educational agency?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So far as I know that is entirely correct.

Mr. HILL. The testing is entirely in the hands of the State educational agency.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HILL. So far as any guidance or counseling of the individual student is concerned, with respect to the courses the student might best take to improve himself in school, that is a matter which is left entirely in the hands of the State and local people, the teachers and counselors in the school. The Federal Government will have nothing to say about guidance and counseling, and the Federal Government will have nothing to say about who does the job or who is employed. There is nothing whatever provided so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

There is to be a small grant of funds, to be matched by the States, to be used for these purposes, but the program will be entirely in the hands of State and local school officials; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is entirely correct.

Mr. HILL. This is something which has been done in regard to schools for many years. Federal funds have been used for such purpose for 40 years, at least, under the vocational education program. There is no difference between what is proposed now and what has been done for 40 years with Federal funds under the vocational education program. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. The Federal Government has nothing whatever to say about who is selected for guidance or counseling, what those persons shall do, or how they shall guide or counsel. That is a matter which is entirely in the hands of the State and local school authorities. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In confirmation of that statement, I shall read again what I read previously from the President's message:

Matching grants to the States to encourage improved State and local testing programs to identify the potential abilities of students at an early stage in their education.

The language is very clear.

Mr. HILL. The provision is on all fours and carries out the recommendation of President Eisenhower. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is what I am trying to emphasize. The President requested that we set up the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 2 minutes in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I admire my remarkable friend from Arizona very much, but as to the amendment now under consideration I must take a position opposed to him. I have given thought and study to this particular phase of the bill, and even today I have discussed it with the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I know something about conditions in my own State. I will say to the Senator from Arizona and to my other colleagues there are many families which are in no position whatever to give the children we are trying to aid by this proposed legislation the counseling and guidance the children need. Many families in my State are first-generation immigrants. The parents in the families sometimes cannot even speak English. The children go to school, and I will say that those children are some of the finest citizens in our State.

The evidence proves the program would be very useful in trying to obtain,

from the high schools in particular, some of the boys and girls with real capabilities who are not able to use their capabilities because they do not know enough of the process. There are families with children who have divorced parents, or parents who are alcoholics, or one thing and another.

Mr. President, I believe this is a worthy program. When the counseling has been done well it has been very valuable. I hope the Senator's amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I agree with my distinguished friend from New Jersey and with my very good friend from Connecticut that guidance coming from teachers is a very desirable and, I repeat, a very natural thing. It is a custom which has been followed by the teachers in our schools, I imagine, ever since the first school was established in this country. I approve of that kind of guidance.

What I do not approve of and what we ought to be wary of is the type of guidance which will come from a professional guidance group set up under the law.

It is all well and good for my friends to say that the States will control the matter, and to hark back to the Vocational Education Act. I will say to my colleagues again that this is one of my fears. The language of section 703 reads:

Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1204.

Once again it will be necessary to come to Washington and present to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the requirements of the State of Arizona, the requirements of the State of New Jersey, and the requirements of the State of Connecticut, before anything can be paid for the guidance program, which should be the natural function of the family and the teacher.

If my colleagues will be so kind as to read section 1204, they will find that section is about 2 pages long and contains a statement of quite a few things which a State must do before payment can be made.

Section 703 provides that these plans can set forth:

A program for testing students in the public secondary schools, and if authorized by law in other secondary schools, of such State to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability.

I shall read from page 759 of the hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with regard to limitations on test procedures, from a statement by Roger W. Russell, executive sec-

retary, American Psychological Association, who was accompanied by Lee J. Cronbach, professor of the University of Illinois. Mr. Russell said:

There is no strong evidence that tests measure potential creativity or inventiveness.

Mr. President, we have had no testimony that such tests are needed. We fall back on the old cliché that the administration wants this program. Perhaps I am a little old-fashioned, but I go back to the idea that we have three separate branches of government. It is our duty to legislate, not to be told by someone at the other end of the avenue or someone in some building halfway down the avenue what we are supposed to do. I do not put much credence in the statement that the administration wants any State in this Union to have any guidance, counseling, and testing program. I think that is a matter for this body to decide.

The second part of section 703 calls for a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools of such State—

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. GOLDWATER. May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THURMOND. The statement was made a few minutes ago, I believe by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], that this matter would be left in the hands of the local authorities. The Senator read from the bottom of page 39 of the bill these words:

The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

Subsection (a) reads as follows:

Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1204 (a)—

And so forth. That means that the Commissioner in Washington must approve the plan. It must be a plan which is directed through the State agency, and not through the local communities. Regardless of how Senators feel as to whether testing is advisable or not, the question here is simply whether we want Washington to be required to approve the counseling, or whether we want to do it back in the States. There is \$15 million that can be given to the States for this purpose, if they consent to let Washington approve these plans. There is no question about the provision. Washington must approve the plans, and I think the Senate ought to be clear on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has once more expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield myself 1 more minute.

I am serious about this amendment. I am very hopeful that the chairman may accept it, inasmuch as there was

practically no evidence showing the need for this service, and the absence of this provision from the bill would make it more palatable to those of us who do not like the idea of Federal aid to education, because my amendment would remove, for this year, one of the direct controls over State participation in the program. To me, if it is not removed, it will serve as a guidepost as to what we can expect in the coming Congresses. If the temper of this Congress prevails in the next one and others to follow, we shall have more and more Federal aid to education, to the point where the local school boards, the local superintendents, and even the State superintendents will have nothing to say about the education of our children.

I urge the Senate to act favorably on my amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "8-11-58-F."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, beginning after "guidance," in line 5, it is proposed to strike out all to the period in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof "and for loans in accordance with part E to be made by the Commissioner to such personnel and teachers while attending such institutes."

On page 31, beginning after "schools," in line 22 it is proposed to strike out all to the period in line 2 on page 32, and insert in lieu thereof "and for loans in accordance with part E to be made by the Commissioner to such individuals while attending such institutes."

On page 32, beginning after "school," in line 17 it is proposed to strike out all to the period in line 20, and insert in lieu thereof "and for loans in accordance with part E to be made by the Commissioner to such individuals while attending such institutes."

On page 33, between lines 6 and 7 it is proposed to insert the following:

PART E—LOANS

Authorization

Sec. 541. (a) Any person who attends an institute established under the provisions of this title shall be entitled to a loan, made in accordance with subsection (b), in the amount of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute in good standing, as determined by the Commissioner.

(b) Loans made under the provisions of this section—

(1) shall be made without security, except that the borrower shall execute a promissory note payable to the United States;

(2) shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in ac-

cordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

(3) may be made in such installments as the Commissioner deems appropriate;

(4) shall bear interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum on the unpaid principal balance thereof, except that no interest shall accrue before the date on which the repayment of the loan is to begin;

(5) shall be repaid, together with interest thereon, in graduated periodic installments, in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner, over a period beginning 1 year after the date on which the borrower ceases to attend such institute and ending not later than 11 years after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on a loan made under this section, and periodic installments need not be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education, (ii) not in excess of 3 years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, or (iii) during which the borrower is serving in a full-time position as a teacher in an elementary or secondary school in any State, (B) any such period shall not be included in determining the 10-year period during which the repayment must be completed, and (C) the borrower may at his option accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan; and

(6) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school in a State, at the rate of $33\frac{1}{3}$ percent of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each complete academic year of such service.

On page 3, it is proposed to amend the table of contents by inserting after "SEC. 531. Determination of eligibility," the following:

PART E—LOANS

SEC. 541. Authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the Senator from Kentucky plans to speak for only a very short time. Then it is hoped that a vote may be had on his amendment. So far as I am aware, the Senate can then vote on the bill. If there are any further amendments, they will go over until tomorrow. If not, a vote will be had on the bill as soon as action is concluded on the pending amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this is the last amendment I shall offer. I shall not ask for a ye and nay vote. I shall ask for a division.

My amendment is directed to title V of the bill. This title establishes 3 institutes, 1 for counseling and guidance training, one for foreign languages, and a third called General Institutes. These institutes would be established in institutions of higher learning by the Commissioner of Education. Their purpose is to train teachers, either in counseling and guidance, in foreign languages, or, in the General Institutes, for general purposes.

Tuition at these institutes would be paid by the Federal Government, and I believe this fair. The committee bill provides also that grants shall be paid to the teachers who attend the institutes, and, in addition, it provides allow-

ances for dependent children when they attend the institutes.

The House bill has a similar title, except that no General Institute is established in the House bill. The House provides that stipends of \$75 weekly shall be paid to teachers attending the institutes, and that allowances for dependent children shall be \$15 a week.

I understand that the usual institute is from 8 to 12 weeks, if we assume 12 weeks, and the stipend would be \$75 a week, \$900 would be paid to a teacher for attending the institute. If there should be a dependent child or two, the allowance would be \$15 or \$30 more per week.

I know that it is difficult for teachers to pay their expenses to attend these institutes. My amendment would not require them to pay their expenses. But I point out the purpose of the institutes is that teachers receiving training in the institute shall return to their schools to teach. I assume that they will return to teach and I believe most of them will.

My amendment proposes to make advances to teachers, in the amount of \$75 a week, with no allowances for dependent children. The allowance would amount to \$900, but it would be a loan, under the easy provisions of the bill. It could be a 12-year loan, but the teacher would not be required to repay the loan if he continued to teach. For my amendment provides that if the teacher attending the institute continues to teach, the loan, whatever its total may be, shall be forgiven at the rate of $33\frac{1}{3}$ percent a year. If the teacher continued to teach for 3 years, the loan would be repaid. Of course, if he should get a better job and leave the teaching profession, it seems to me that he should repay the loan over a period of 12 years, for the purpose of the institute is to train teachers for continued teaching. My amendment is fair to teachers selected for the institutes, for they would not be out of pocket for their expenses and could repay in money, or $33\frac{1}{3}$ percent of the loan would be forgiven for each year of teaching. It is fairer to other teachers who would not get Federal help and who must take advance training, and are forced to pay all their expenses.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that the Senator's amendment could serve a useful purpose, if I correctly understand it. As I understand, it would not change the availability of funds to aid teachers to take these special courses.

Mr. COOPER. Not at all. Every teacher admitted would receive full expense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it does provide that, instead of being an outright gift, the allowance shall be in the form of a loan, which will be forgiven at the rate of one-third for each year the teacher may continue to teach the courses afterward.

Mr. COOPER. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that is on all fours with the principle we followed during the war, when we provided for the medical education of certain students, and required that they should serve at least 1 year—or whatever the requirement was—in the Medical Corps of one of the military branches. That insured that in return for the medical education and for deferment from other military service, the Government would get some service in the Medical Corps.

In this instance the Senator is attempting to make certain that where money is advanced to teachers for obtaining special courses that they will actually spend some time in teaching those courses afterwards, or else repay the money.

Mr. COOPER. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The amendment has been very much clarified by the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota. To sum it up, the Senator's amendment replaces the stipends or gifts with loans. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the sum and substance of it. The Cooper amendment would provide loans which could be repaid or earned back, so to speak, if the people performed their teaching services.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I were to describe the amendment, I would call it the birth control amendment. The elimination of the provision for dependent children is quite unrealistic and fails to take into account a practical problem which confronts us in regard to the small institutes. We have a good many teachers in secondary schools who have large families. They are recognized as teachers who have great teaching potentialities, and who ought to be encouraged to take further training.

What do they have to do? They are already paid such low salaries that the fathers of large families in the teaching profession have to engage in some other work during the summer.

I am not talking about exceptional cases. The cases exist by the hundreds. It is recognized that if we are to give these particular individuals the advantages they need and make it possible for them to get better positions in the teaching professions, so they can make greater contributions, it is necessary to send them to institutes.

What do they say? They say, "We cannot afford to do it, because we do not have the funds to take care of our children." The unmarried teachers or the young married teachers with very small families can go, but the amendment makes it impossible for the teachers with the big families to go to the institute. We must face up to the reality of the teachers' families. A very competent teacher ought to be encour-

aged to go to an institute. It is only common sense that we ought to make an arrangement for the payment of an additional stipend to help take care of a larger family, so that the father of the family may take the institute training.

I happen to be against birth control, particularly in this kind of situation. Therefore I oppose the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In committee we discussed the subject of the stipends. It seemed that that was the least we could do for the teachers who are willing to undergo the training.

The amendment would effect a complete departure from the policies and regulations previously established by Congress for the conduct of training institutes by the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Health, as well as the training programs conducted by other government agencies, such as the professional nurse traineeship program, the public health traineeship program, and the vocational rehabilitation program.

The Teachers Institutes in title V of S. 4237 will be modeled on these programs. They will be administered by the institutions of higher education, under the supervision of the Commissioner of Education. I think we can assume that the Commissioner will approve only those institutes which conform to the pattern already established by Congress, and which are approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Therefore I cannot support the Cooper amendment. I urge that the Senate retain the present language of the Institute title.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if we adopt the amendment we discriminate against the teachers of our country, the poorest paid, most underpaid, the most miserably paid group in America.

Under the Public Health Service, under the training program for professional nurses, under the program of the National Science Foundation, under the programs of vocational rehabilitation, and under all other Government programs we provide stipends. The amendment would pick out the teachers and deny the stipends to the teachers when they take a short 4-week course in the summertime. If we required them to pay back these stipends, it would cost the Government more in redtape and in administration and in the collection of these loans than it would cost by giving them the same benefits we give to the other people under the various Government programs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for a division on the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 4237) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that, under the order previously entered, the bill having been read the third time, the Senate now proceeds to the consideration of H. R. 13247, the companion House bill, to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs, to meet critical national needs, and for other purposes; that the House bill is deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of S. 4237, as amended; and that the amendment is deemed to be engrossed and the bill, as amended, read the third time.

The bill (H. R. 13247), as amended, is now before the Senate, and the question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

Less than a year ago, the Russian sputnik shocked us out of our complacency. I sincerely hope the scientific successes and development of our own country since that date have not lulled us to sleep. By enacting into law S. 4237, we will assure ourselves that we will be graduating in the future the scientists, engineers, technicians, and mathematicians so important to us in this highly technical world in which we live today. These will be the men and women who will help forge the progress and leadership our Nation must possess if we are to regain a position of unquestioned world leadership.

I am happy to rise in support of this National Defense Education Act of 1958. When Congress reconvened last January, I introduced several education bills of my own, namely: S. 2916, S. 2917, and S. 3281. I had hoped that we could act swiftly on these education measures so that they could become effective in the school year beginning next month. I was convinced that we could regain unquestioned world leadership in science and technology only through our educators and our system of education. That is why I felt it was so essential that Congress act early in the session. I regret that this was not done.

I am pleased, however, that we have the opportunity to enact effective education legislation now, before we adjourn. I am particularly pleased that S. 4237 includes most of what I had proposed in the bills I introduced last January. My bills included a national scholarship program and provision for loans to colleges and universities for

science equipment and facilities. Both of these items are included in the Hill bill.

There are many other worthwhile features in the National Defense Education Act which I will not enumerate, but I do want to go on record in support of this bill as a "giant step" in the right direction.

I regret the action of the House of Representatives in eliminating the scholarship provisions of their version of the bill. I strongly feel that we must include a scholarship program if we are going to encourage the most apt of our students to continue their education beyond the high school level. A loan program will not provide sufficient motivation to bring into our colleges and universities the number of future scientists, engineers, and technicians our country needs. Therefore, I want to go on record as favoring the provision in the bill now before us which calls for 23,000 4-year scholarships.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several telegrams and a letter I received on the pending subject.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELY, NEV., August 11, 1958.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly request you oppose Federal scholarship bills now before Senate. Expenditure not justified; too much Federal interference in schools as is. Federal money would undoubtedly put controls on curriculum of both the recipient and the college of their choice. Regards.

THOMAS A. SMITH,
Member, Nevada State Council on
Education.

BATTLE MOUNTAIN, NEV., August 9, 1958.
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly oppose any action on Federal scholarship.

E. DIGRAZIA,
Member, State Council on Education.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., August 11, 1958.
Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please vote in opposition to any further Federal aid to education and to Federal scholarship.

Sincerely,
Mrs. J. DEWEY SOLOMON,
Mrs. WENDELL BUNKER.

RENO, NEV., August 8, 1958.
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your opposition to Federal scholarship bills.

S. VERNON WINES.

BOULDER CITY, NEV., August 8, 1958.
Senator MOLLY MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please vote to oppose Federal scholarship bill.

LILLIAN COLLINS.

ELKO, NEV., August 8, 1958.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We repeat our resolution being directly opposed to Federal aid to education, particularly pending bills on Federal aid to scholarships.

R. H. PEARCE,
President, Elko Chamber of Commerce.

JIGGS, NEV., August 7, 1958.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please oppose the Federal scholarship bill which will be in the Senate for debate next week, I understand.

We oppose Federal aid to our schools—our last stand against socialism.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

FERN J. BARNES,

Member, Citizens Committee on Education.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the bill because I believe it will—

First. Bring about the destruction of the privately financed scholarship foundations.

Second. Drive the students of highest ability from the hundreds of small colleges of the Nation to a few colleges of high prestige.

Third. Enlarge the power and the size of an already oversized Federal Government incapable, because of its bigness, to efficiently manage its affairs and finances.

Fourth. Lead to the control of our educational system by the Federal Government, with its dangerous potentialities of exercising centralized influence and of limiting academic freedom.

Fifth. Weaken private, municipal and State initiative in educational affairs.

Sixth. Emphasis the fallacious belief that Federal moneys are the cure for all evils.

Seventh. Fail to recognize the frightening fiscal predicament of the Federal Government at a time when State and local governments are financially in a far better position to finance the scholarships if they are necessary. There is not a State in the Nation which is not in a better financial position than the Federal Government to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield to no one in the confidence I have in the youth of our country. I think they are much smarter than we realize. We have been talking about giving them something: grants, gifts, stipends, loans. Yet the Government of the United States cannot manage its affairs so as to pay the current costs of government.

A deficit of \$10 billion or \$12 billion will accrue this year. Whose debt will it be? It will be the debt of the youth of the land.

Tonight we try to "kid" them and say, "We will increase the debt a little and give you something." But we cannot even pay the current costs of government. With more people employed in the United States than ever before in its history, with all the years of prosperity which our country has enjoyed, the Government is unable to manage its affairs without adding to the debt.

The greatest thing we can do for the youth of America is to pass on to them our American heritage; to make secure for them our economic system; to assure the solvency of the Federal Government.

For many years people have raised their voices about the Federal debt. But I submit that if the deficit of the current year continues to increase at this rate for 10 years, we will reach the point of no return.

Congress has instigated program after program to add to the debt and place it on the shoulders of the youth of the Nation. Tonight we insult their intelligence by telling them we are going to give them something. We send word to the people back home: "Do not reappraise your schools. Do not have town meetings to see what you can do to improve your educational facilities. Uncle Sam will do it for you."

We shall be directing a blow at the best kind of education if we pass the bill. Make no mistake about it; this is not a bill for Federal aid to education; it is a bill for Federal education.

Many persons were shocked when the Army marched into Little Rock to run the schools. If we pass the bill, before many years there will be an army of psychologists, counselors, guidance experts, inspectors, bureaucrats, and others who will approve or disapprove the local plans and will direct and select the teachers who are to institute the programs. What teachers will they be? They will be those who will go along.

Mr. President, this is Federal education. It is beginning tonight. The cost enumerated here is small compared with what it will be. There is nothing in the bill which changes the courses of study. There is nothing which provides that the money shall be used to redirect teaching efforts.

This is a bill to take education away from the parents and the localities, and to place it in bureaucratic Washington.

I hope the bill will be defeated. If it is not, the President of the United States ought to defeat it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Hear! Hear!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, who said this is a day of decision in American history, because we are deciding, at midnight, whether we will let the educational system of the United States drift away or whether the power of the Federal Government will be put into the scale on the

side of a better educational system for the American people.

Mr. President, these are times which challenge America's military, intellectual, spiritual, and material leadership. This is our day of decision. What we do here today can represent a beginning in this Nation's answer to the Communist challenge in education and to our own increased educational needs. America must educate more young people in the highly complex skills which the Nation needs to sustain and to continue to progress in the free world.

Our answer to the Nation's educational needs is based, in part, upon information and advice which resulted from the valuable and constructive hearings held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The committee discussed these needs with outstanding scientists, leaders, educators, and representatives of professional organizations. We have weighed the evidence, we have measured the facts, and I, for one, am thoroughly convinced that they call for action on the part of this Congress.

There can be no question—time does not permit further delay in remedying the fact that—

First. Excellence in scholastic achievement continues to go largely unrewarded. Each year almost one-half of the Nation's most talented and capable students do not continue their education beyond the high school. This results in a serious loss of the optimum development of brainpower so vitally needed in the industrial and defense efforts of our time.

Second. Thousands of capable students who would pursue higher education in preparation for careers in teaching or science are discouraged by the cost of 4 years of college, which has more than doubled since 1940.

Countless thousands of other students of good potential do not pursue post-high-school studies because of a lack of motivation in the home, in the school, and in the larger community.

Third. At a time when the technically and scientifically trained person is most needed, about 100,000 seniors attend public high schools where no advanced mathematics of any kind is offered. Only 1 out of 3 students takes a chemistry course; 1 out of 4, physics; 1 out of 3, intermediate algebra; and 1 out of 8, trigonometry or solid geometry.

Fourth. The foreign language picture is equally dim. Of all public high schools in the United States, 56.4 percent offer no modern foreign language instruction to their students, not quite half of the public high schools in 25 States teach modern foreign languages.

Fifth. There are still 91,500 full-time teachers in our public schools who hold less than standard certificates. This situation is further complicated by the failure of most of the States to develop modern foreign language, mathematics, and science courses of study and teachers guides.

Schools have been slow in adopting newer methods which would enhance the teaching-learning situation such as the mass mediums of television, radio, films, and other audio-visual aids.

Sixth. The quality of instruction in higher education in no small measure will determine the excellence of our future professional men and women. We must prevent further deterioration in the qualifications of teachers in our institutions of higher education. This gradual breakdown is reflected by the fact that in 1953-54, 31 percent of new college teachers had doctoral degrees. Three years later this figure had dropped to only 23 percent, which indicates a serious deterioration in the qualifications of new college teachers.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the senior Senator from Alabama, stated upon the occasion of the opening of the recent hearings on science and education for national defense:

We Americans know we must mobilize our Nation's brainpower in the struggle for survival.

In the interest of national defense the Federal Government must undertake a definite role in the solution of certain educational problems. I think Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University summarized this point quite adequately when he stated:

In the interest of not only national defense, but also the maintenance of our system of Government and the free-enterprise system itself * * * the Federal Government must do everything in its power to improve and strengthen our American educational system by stimulating, motivating, and supporting both private and local governmental efforts to improve the effectiveness of American education.

The testimony heard by the Senate committee, the reports, and studies of various groups concerned with education, all substantiate one prevailing fact: The greatest need in American education today is a new emphasis on the pursuit of learning, and a new esteem for academic teaching and academic accomplishment. We have already said that the fullest utilization of our brainpower resources must be accomplished if we would advance scientific research, man our commerce and industry, staff our schools and fill our public offices with qualified people.

The National Defense Education Act has been carefully and thoughtfully designed to offer assistance to the States to help them improve and expand the quality of their educational programs where it is most needed.

In summarizing the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, the committee reports that—

Scholarship awards are offered to stimulate and challenge high school students to do their best, and to stimulate parents to insist not only that their children work hard, but that their schools provide the proper courses of instruction. Additional scholarship grants based on need will also aid scholarship winners to complete a 4-year college education. Student loans will be available to other highly qualified college students needing financial assistance.

A limited number of fellowship grants are offered those who advance into graduate school to obtain their doctoral degrees and thus better qualify themselves to be college instructors.

Secondary—and elementary-school teachers will have the opportunity to attend spe-

cial institutes where they may increase their knowledge of the subjects they teach. Able students will be encouraged to become teachers by a forgiveness feature in the student loan program under which recipients who later enter the teaching profession will have their loans canceled in 5 years at the rate of 20 percent for each year they teach.

The bill provides for aptitude testing of children as they are entering high school, in order to identify the particular talents and potentialities of each child. To assure that all of our children, and especially those most gifted intellectually, can be encouraged to develop their abilities to the maximum, guidance and counseling services will help high school students along paths of study best suited to their individual capacities, and will give particular attention to urging that the ablest and most promising take the courses that will qualify them for admission to college.

Provision is made for research and experimentation in the use of television and other modern media of communication for educational purposes.

To enable students to secure the most benefit from courses in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, grants will be made to State educational agencies, on a matching basis, for purchase of modern laboratory equipment.

To help meet the defense and foreign relations needs of the Nation, language and area centers will be provided to give instruction in the language and culture of foreign peoples, especially those in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and the Soviet Union.

To help assure an adequate supply of technical personnel to assist scientists and engineers, area vocational educational schools will be created to give instruction in techniques and skills essential to the national defense.

To assure that scientists and researchers shall have available to them the latest developments in their fields, there is established a science information service for indexing, abstracting, translating, and distributing to American scientists the findings of scientific research throughout the world.

By enacting the bill, we will say to the American people, that this Nation will recognize and reward scholastic achievement through a well-constructed program of scholarships. We say also, that we must improve guidance, counseling, and testing in order that we can identify capable students and help students attain the heights of their potential. We would further recognize the Nation's urgent need to have more well-taught science, mathematics and modern foreign language courses.

One of the most valuable features of the national defense education proposal is that it reflects awareness of the dependency of one phase of learning upon another. For example, the bill would help to meet some of our more specific needs for the scientific and professionally trained person. At the same time it recognizes the continuing value of existing programs such as vocational education and its role in the training of technicians. The better reporting of statistics on education and the need for better scientific information receive due and proper attention under the provisions of this act. The design of this legislation will not allow us to rob Peter to pay Paul.

The fulfillment of America's educational needs presents our citizens with one of the most demanding, most imper-

ative and most momentous tasks of these times. The strategic importance of good education has both national and international implications: First, the forward progress of our own society both in terms of productive living and responsible citizenship depends upon a more highly trained, more informed, enlightened and learned citizenry, because the effects of education are felt in every phase of society, the task of overcoming long-existing deficiencies, of enriching present programs, and of improving and expanding each of our State school systems is truly momentous; and, second, America as a democratic society and as one of the leaders of the world's free peoples must be able to respond to the scientific, technical and educational challenges of another nation which seeks only to further the cause of totalitarianism.

To me, one of the most expeditious and feasible means by which this challenge can be met, and the problems of American education soundly solved is through a system of Federal assistance to the States for those programs which are in most dire need of attention. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 would provide that Federal assistance. I consider this proposal to be a sound and purposeful measure through which the Federal Government may make a responsible and significant contribution to the solution of our educational problems. My membership on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and participation in the hearings concerning science and education for national defense have served to strengthen my conviction that the enactment of S. 4327 is a must.

Mr. President, I commend the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the senior Senator from Alabama, for his unfailing courtesy and the great patience and care with which the hearings were conducted. They reflect credit upon him, on the committee, and on the Government of the United States. Likewise, I pay my sincere tribute to the educators who testified before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are about to act on one of the most important measures of this or any other session.

The Nation can be no stronger than its people. Modern machines have performed miracles. But they cannot, no matter how complicated, replace the human mind.

It would be difficult to imagine a more complicated field of legislation than this. There is no doubt of our need to strengthen the educational system of our country. But at the same time, we do not want to encase our system in a totalitarian mold.

Americans value deeply the traditional system under which the control of education will be in the hands of the local people who are affected. They rightly do not want to abandon that system.

We were looking for a way through which help could be extended without the control of Federal bureaucracy. And in this bill I believe we have found it.

Our Nation is very fortunate that standing at the helm of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee was the very able, very experienced, senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I know of no more effective legislator in the Senate—no man who does a better job in representing his State and serving his country.

The committee approaches the problems with prudence, with caution, and with a desire to produce an effective, workable bill. Fortunately, the committee consists of men extremely well-qualified to handle the problem.

The thanks of the Senate and the thanks of the Nation are due the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and my own colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Equal thanks are due the members of the minority who were led by the scholarly senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I think that since he is retiring from the Senate this is a fitting measure to serve as a climax to his distinguished legislative career.

The same can be said of our dedicated senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Of course, there were Members who opposed this bill. But again, they debated the issues and kept consideration of the measure on a plane befitting its importance.

This generation will be remembered as the one which permitted the education of our children to slip behind the present-day level of human knowledge. Let us hope that it will not also be remembered for failure to remedy this deplorable situation once we became aware of it.

It took the Soviet satellites and the Soviet ballistic missiles to arouse us to the full dimensions of our peril. We have taken many steps since Sputnik I, seeking to close the gap.

We have appropriated billions of dollars for missiles, planes, and scientific research. We have reorganized the Defense Department. We have established a Space Agency. We have increased material incentives to keep our skilled and able men in the armed services.

This represents a tremendous investment of the resources and the energy of the American people.

I would remind my colleagues of another tremendous investment in the resources and the energies of the people of a proud Nation. It was the Maginot Line behind which France thought it could sit in safety.

Tons of concrete were poured into the Maginot Line. The ablest artillery experts of the time carefully implaced guns of every description to cover every conceivable spot in front of the line.

Elaborate systems of underground transportation were laid out. There were elevators and cars and devices to insure the indefinite preservation of the French soldiers who manned the line.

But despite the concrete and the guns and the elaborate fortifications, the Maginot Line did not slow up the advance of the German armies for a day once they began to move. The Maginot Line represented one of the most wasteful investments in all of history simply because it had a fatal weakness—it could be outflanked.

The billions of dollars that we have spent on missiles, planes, guns, ships, radar, and the other implements of modern war could easily become another Maginot Line. The instruments are worthless if we do not have educated minds to control them.

There is no security except in people. The Atlas, the Thor, and the Jupiter will be obsolete within a few years. And once they are obsolete there will be nothing left of our investment in them except the experience we have gained.

But there is one investment in which the United States can never lose. It is the investment in the minds of our young people. I wish to say to my colleagues that it would be a mistake to consider this measure solely from the standpoint of national defense. I believe a major issue before our country is that of security, but we would live within narrow and limited horizons if we thought that security was a matter of weapons alone.

Security consists of people who are alert, people who are vigilant, and people who are trained to cope with the tremendous problems of the modern world.

We cannot cope with those problems unless we have men skilled in physics, chemistry, mathematics, astronomy, and all of the natural sciences, but neither can we cope with them if our training is solely in the natural sciences.

We look for citizens who are broad-gauged, who understand the workings of our system, who are conscious of the great heritage of our culture. We need men and women who understand Aristotle as well as Darwin; who are as familiar with Shakespeare as they are with Einstein and Newton. The time may come when we will have to take up arms once again to defend our heritage. But we must know what it is that we are defending, and even more important we must know the kind of world which we wish to extend and create so that our descendants can live in peace and progress.

Mr. President, this measure is an important step in that direction. It is only the first step but, as such, it is an historic landmark and the Nation owes a debt of eternal gratitude to those who contributed to its achievement.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). All time has been yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Allott	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hoblitzell	Morton
Barrett	Humphrey	Mundt
Beall	Ives	Neuberger
Bush	Jackson	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Proxmire
Case, N. J.	Jordan	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Revercomb
Church	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Clark	Kerr	Smathers
Cooper	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Long	Symington
Ervin	Magnuson	Thye
Fulbright	Mansfield	Wiley
Gore	Martin, Iowa	Yarborough
Green	McClellan	Young
Hayden	McNamara	

NAYS—26

Bennett	Eastland	Robertson
Bible	Frear	Russell
Bricker	Goldwater	Schoepfel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Butler	Hruska	Talmadge
Byrd	Jenner	Thurmond
Capehart	Lausche	Watkins
Curtis	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Martin, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—8

Chavez	Holland	O'Mahoney
Dirksen	Javits	Payne
Flanders	Murray	

So the bill H. R. 13247 was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, to attend the funeral services of Representative McVey. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent, because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate, to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference, in London, as chairman of the Economic Section of the General Affairs Committee. If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 4237 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make, in House bill 13247, all necessary technical and clerical changes, including changes in section and subsection numbers and letters, and cross references thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN-POLICY ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today, once again, the world had an opportunity to contrast the attitude of America and the attitude of communism toward international affairs.

Today, the President of our country appeared before the United Nations. He laid down the program that the United States is willing to support. It consisted of proposals which went right to the heart of the problem.

The President's speech recognized that we must look to the future, and not confine ourselves solely to the past. It was based on the proposition that the people of the world must get ahead, rather than get even.

He called for a cooperative effort to develop the resources of the Middle East, rather than a destructive effort to tear the Middle East to pieces.

I think the people of our Nation realize that there can be no peace so long as there are countries whose citizens live in bitter poverty and humiliation. I think they are also aware that while the citizens of those countries must be helped, the emphasis must be on helping them to help themselves.

Mr. President, it was reported that the delegates of the Soviet Union did not applaud throughout the address. Instead, they met the proposals of this country with cold silence.

This is the sharp contrast—the contrast between a nation that desires progress and a philosophy that desires revenge. The world will take note of this contrast.

The President's speech today was the beginning of a constructive approach to the problems of a strife-ridden part of the world. Let us hope that it can be carried through to the benefit of all who love peace.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that we expect to have the Senate consider the following measures:

House bill 13450, the supplemental appropriation bill. The Senate will probably consider it tomorrow, if it is available.

Calendar No. 2233, House bill 11668, amending the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917.

Calendar No. 2280, House bill 8361, amending the law with respect to applications for writs of habeas corpus.

Calendar No. 2248, Senate bill 3648, authorizing construction of the Navaho Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama diversion project.

Calendar No. 2255, Senate bill 1887, authorizing construction of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project.

Calendar No. 2194, House bill 9833, amending section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1927.

Calendar No. 1373, Senate bill 2883, relating to extension of the east front of the Capitol.

I desire to have all of these bills available for consideration when the session of the Senate convenes at 12 o'clock noon today.

HOUSE BILL 8361 AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RIGHT TO HABEAS CORPUS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the keystone in the whole superstructure of the rights of individuals guaranteed by our Constitution is the right to habeas corpus. This is probably the most fundamental and most sacred and most necessary right to free men. The right to have tested in court the validity of the order or judgment by which an American is deprived of his liberty is essential if we are to preserve individual liberty from the tyranny of evil design or fumbling error.

There has recently—on August 6—been reported from the Judiciary Committee, without hearings, House bill 8361, which would cripple the authority of Federal courts to issue writs of habeas corpus. The bill passed the House without hearings. While the House has announced that the purpose of the bill is to "restrain the abuse of the use of the writ of habeas corpus in the lower Federal courts by prisoners who have been convicted in State courts," an examination of the bill makes it apparent that such a charge is not warranted by the facts. Even if abuses were shown to exist, the greater abuse which would ensue would be the abuse of the rights of Americans to have access to the courts. Use of habeas corpus is already hedged with sufficient safeguards including the integrity and good sense of the Federal bench; so the alleged abuse does not constitute a problem of sufficient importance to warrant this drastic curb on our rights.

An excellent editorial, published on August 12 in the Milwaukee Journal, clearly sets forth the issue this bill presents to this body. The editorial rightly points out:

Some tardy vigilance is now required on the Senate floor to stop this wrong-headed measure—at least until another session can go studiously and publicly into so vital a subject.

The same bill was before a previous session of Congress; and the arguments now advanced for its support were marshalled then. The arguments in favor of the bill were most thoughtfully and fairly considered, and, I may add, were completely demolished in a very scholarly article by Louis H. Pollak, associate professor of law at Yale University. The article appeared in the Yale Law Journal for November 1956.

I most earnestly commend the article for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues in the Senate; and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Yale Law Journal, volume 66, No. 1, November 1956]

PROPOSAL TO CURTAIL FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS FOR STATE PRISONERS: COLLATERAL ATTACK ON THE GREAT WRIT

(By Louis H. Pollak, associate professor of law, Yale Law School)

(The author wishes to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Louise E. Farr, Research Associate, Yale Law School.)

"We propose now to show this committee by illustrative cases what happens when Federal courts intervene in behalf of prisoners convicted in State courts by means of Federal habeas corpus. There are literally hundreds of cases from all States, and we can only select a few."

"In one respect this (*Leyra v. Denno*) is the most significant case of all that we have discussed in that it shows how a case can be tried in the State courts, going all the way to the highest Appellate Court of New York, a new trial granted, the case tried again, and appealed to the Appellate Court of the State of New York, and affirmed. All State remedies having been exhausted and the case having been fully tried in all the courts of the State of New York, with certiorari denied by the Supreme Court of the United States, Leyra then sued out a petition for writ of habeas corpus in one of the United States district courts of New York, and the case then went the full routine of Federal hearings through the circuit court of appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States. The outstanding significance of this case is that it shows and clearly demonstrates that the same questions can be litigated fully in all the courts of the State, the petitioner can then ask the Supreme Court of the United States for certiorari to pass on these same questions, and the Supreme Court of the United States refuses the application for certiorari. The identical questions (competency of confession) have been litigated through all the Federal courts and the Supreme Court of the United States then grants certiorari, although it had previously refused to do so when the matter was going through the

State courts and on the same question of confessions; the certiorari, however, is granted when the case comes through the Federal courts on the same question of confessions, and the Supreme Court of the United States then reverses the case and orders another trial. We do not know the final disposition of the case."¹

THE PROBLEM

The quoted indictment of the tedious proceedings in *Leyra v. Denno*² is part of a long memorandum submitted by Ralph Moody, Assistant Attorney General of North Carolina, to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives on June 24, 1955. Mr. Moody submitted the memorandum on behalf of the National Association of Attorneys General in support of a then pending bill designed to curtail the jurisdiction of Federal courts to inquire, on habeas corpus, into the propriety of State court criminal convictions. The specific legislative proposal, H. R. 5649,³ passed the House of Representatives but died in the Senate Judiciary Committee when the 84th Congress, on July 27, 1956, adjourned sine die. But the problem troubling Mr. Moody and his colleagues did not die with the bill. In all likelihood the next Congress will be confronted with similar legislation. Mr. Moody's quarrel with the existing latitude of Federal habeas corpus poses issues demanding the devoted attention of those concerned with the smooth functioning of the Federal system. Yet the issues are not new—they are as old as the Constitution.

It is familiar history that the Constitutional Convention, after vigorous and precocious debate, recognized that the new National Government, superimposed on pre-existing States jealous of their sovereignty, must be endowed with power to establish its own judicial system—a system necessarily overlapping the functions of the existing State courts. It was, to be sure, the plain intent of the framers that Congress should make use of the State tribunals whenever it could be done, with safety to the general interest.⁴ But emphasis on the desirability of restraint in establishing Federal jurisdiction only underscored the fact that concurrent judicial power portended conflict—and conflict under the supremacy clause could in the last analysis only mean that the national tribunals would have ultimate revisory power.

Transforming this theoretical imperative of revisory power into reality could not have been easy in any event; but it necessarily provoked profoundest parochial antagonism in criminal cases. When the Supreme Court issued its writ of error to review Corn Tassel's death sentence, the Georgia authorities showed their sovereign contempt for the Court's process by executing the defendant and thereby effectively mooting his appeal.⁵ But that was in 1830—only 14 years after Justice Story, reversing a recalcitrant Vir-

ginia Court of Appeals, indelibly blueprinted the Supreme Court's power to overturn judgments of State courts,⁶ and a scant 9 years after Chief Justice Marshall first asserted the Supreme Court's power to review a State criminal conviction.⁷ Today, although Georgia and Virginia mutter threats of interposition against Supreme Court decisions in other fields,⁸ no serious question is raised about the Court's appellate authority to set aside State criminal convictions secured in violation of federally protected rights.

The question vexing Mr. Moody—and currently besetting judges, legislators, prosecutors and convicts—is the propriety and scope of an alternative and allegedly less palatable form of Federal intervention: Federal district court jurisdiction to make collateral inquiry into State court criminal convictions. Since 1867, the so-called inferior Federal courts have been empowered, on habeas corpus, to reopen all cases where any person may be restrained of his or her liberty in violation of the Constitution, or of any treaty or law of the United States * * *.⁹ Initially, this auxiliary form of Federal inquiry was only a minor nuisance to State authorities, since conventionally the State's burden on habeas corpus was merely to show that the State court was one of competent jurisdiction.¹⁰ Gradually, however, the Federal inquiry on habeas corpus has widened. The Federal judge's job, the Supreme Court announced in 1915, was "to look beyond forms and inquire into the very substance of the matter, to the extent of deciding whether the prisoner has been deprived of his liberty without due process of law * * *."¹¹ This formula, coupled with latter-day judicial amplification of the content of due process of law, laid the basis for what has now become a substantial volume of habeas corpus applications from State prisoners serving jail terms or awaiting execution.

Typically, the applicant will urge that the State trial was fatally tainted by lack of counsel,¹² by a coerced confession,¹³ by officially suborned perjury,¹⁴ by discriminatory

jury selection,¹⁵ or by other deprivations of 14th amendment rights.¹⁶ If (1) the moving papers adequately set forth facts raising substantial Federal questions, (2) the applicant (a) has raised the Federal questions in a State proceeding and has unsuccessfully sought certiorari from the adverse State judgment,¹⁷ or (b) has no available avenue of effective State collateral attack,¹⁸ and (3) the Federal questions are ones not litigated by a Federal court on a prior application for habeas corpus,¹⁹ the district court must hear and determine the issues presented.

From July 1940 through June 1941—what may be regarded as the year of transition from the old to the new Supreme Court—Federal district courts received 127 applications for habeas corpus from persons in State custody.²⁰ In 1955, after 15 years of heightened Supreme Court insistence on fair criminal procedures, the volume of applications had increased over fivefold—to 660.²¹ But the percentage of applications in which relief was granted was never large and has not risen. On the contrary—in 1946 (when applications were at about the 500 mark) only 2.8 percent of the applications had some measure of success, and by 1954 even that figure had shrunk to 1.8 percent.²² Indeed, the proportion of applicants whom the Federal courts finally order discharged from State custody probably does not exceed the minuscule figure of 0.15 percent—about one applicant per year.²³ Moreover—and this tellingly underscores the insufficiency of the average application—from 1941 to 1954 only 7.3 percent of the cases reached the hearing stage, and in the past few years this latter figure has fallen to about 4 percent.²⁴

It has not been hard to infer from statistics of this kind "that literally hundreds and thousands of phony habeas corpus proceedings now clutter up and confuse an already overcrowded Federal docket."²⁵ Acceptance of this conclusion has led not unnaturally to the view that current habeas corpus practice squanders the energies and budgets of Federal courts and State law enforcement officials. It accomplishes nothing, so it is urged, except educating idle convicts in the niceties of criminal procedure and delaying society's rightful day of retribution in capital cases like *Leyra v. Denno*.²⁶

²³ *Brown v. Allen* (344 U. S. 443 (1953)).

²⁴ *Louisiana ex rel. Francis v. Resweber* (329 U. S. 459 (1947) (double jeopardy and cruel and unusual punishment)); *Cochran v. Kansas* (316 U. S. 255 (1942) (suppression by prison officials of appeals documents)); *Frank v. Mangum* (237 U. S. 309 (1915) (mob domination of trial)). See, generally, Note, Federal Habeas Corpus for State Prisoners, 55 Colum. L. Rev. 196 (1955).

²⁵ *Dart v. Burford* (339 U. S. 200 (1950), construing 28 U. S. C. sec. 2254 (1952)).

²⁶ 28 U. S. C. sec. 2254 (1952).

²⁷ 28 U. S. C. sec. 2244 (1952).

²⁸ Hearings 24, table 1. The statistics are the product of studies of habeas corpus litigation by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

²⁹ Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Ann. Rep. 1955, at 169, Table C 3 (1956).

³⁰ Hearings 25, Table 3.

³¹ See the comprehensive discussion of habeas corpus practice contained in Justice Frankfurter's separate opinion in *Brown v. Allen* (344 U. S. 443, 498 (1953)); this opinion, to which several references are hereafter made under the designation "separate opinion," is to be distinguished from the dissent on the merits filed by Justice Frankfurter in the same case and companion cases. 344 U. S. at 554.

³² Hearings 24, Table 2.

³³ 102 CONG. REC. 801-02 (daily ed. Jan. 19, 1956).

³⁴ 347 U. S. 558 (1954); see text at note 1 supra and notes 56-66 infra.

⁶ *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee*, 14 U. S. (1 Wheat.) *304 (1816).

⁷ *Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U. S. (6 Wheat.) *264 (1821) (motion to dismiss writ of error overruled; conviction then affirmed on merits).

⁸ See Georgia House Resolution 185, 1 Race Relations L. Rep. 438 (1956), and Virginia Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, 1 Race Relations L. Rep. 445 (1956), both directed at the Supreme Court's decisions in the school segregation cases, 347 U. S. 483, 497 (1954), and 349 U. S. 294 (1955).

⁹ Act of February 5, 1867, 14 Stat. 385. The statutory language has been altered in detail but not in substance, 28 U. S. C. sec. 2241 (3) (1952); cf. 28 U. S. C. sec. 2254 (1952).

The Habeas Corpus Act of 1867 was passed some months after Congress proposed the 14th amendment to the States but over a year before the ratification process was completed. The act was plainly intended to help safeguard the new statutory and constitutional rights created after the Civil War. See note, The Freedom Writ—The Expanded Use of Federal Habeas Corpus, 61 Harv. L. Rev. 657, 659 (1948).

¹⁰ See, e. g., *Ex parte Bridges*, 4 Fed. Cas. No. 1862, at 106 (C. C. N. D. Ga. 1875).

¹¹ *Frank v. Mangum* (237 U. S. 309, 331 (1915)); see *Moore v. Dempsey* (261 U. S. 86 (1923)).

¹² *Wade v. Mayo* (334 U. S. 672 (1948)); *House v. Mayo* (324 U. S. 42 (1945)).

¹³ *Leyra v. Denno* (347 U. S. 556 (1954)).

¹⁴ *Ex parte Hawk* (321 U. S. 114, 115-116 (1944)); *Mooney v. Holohan* (294 U. S. 103 (1935)).

¹ Excerpts from statement of Ralph Moody, assistant attorney general of North Carolina, in support of H. R. 5649, hearings on H. R. 5649 before subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 84th Cong., 1st sess. at 45, 51 (1955) (hereinafter cited as hearings).

² 347 U. S. 556 (1954).

³ 84th Cong., 1st Sess. (1955).

The bill is set forth verbatim in the text at p. 57 infra.

⁴ The language is that of Roger Sherman, advocating the successful compromise that gave Congress discretion to establish Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court. See 2 Farrand, The Records of the Federal Convention 45-46 (1911).

⁵ Warren, Legislative and Judicial Attacks on the Supreme Court of the United States—A History of the 25th section of the Judiciary Act, 47 Am. L. Rev. 161, 167 (1913).

House Aug 18, 1957

11. PERSONNEL. Passed as reported H. R. 9407, to provide additional opportunity for certain employees to obtain career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive service. p. 16848
Passed without amendment S. 4004, to encourage transfers of Federal employees for service with international organizations. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 16849-49
Passed as reported S. 3195, to authorize certain retired Federal personnel to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries. pp. 16850-66
12. INSPECTION SERVICES. Passed without amendment S. 3873, to permit the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies without reimbursement or transfer of funds. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 16867
13. MINING CLAIMS. Passed over without prejudice, at the request of Rep. Saylor, S. 2039, to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor. p. 16867
14. EDUCATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill. p. 16887
15. SALINE WATER. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a report on "S. J. Res. 135, relating to the conversion of saline water to potable uses." p. D871
16. LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE. Rep. Arends objected to scheduling numerous bills in the House for consideration under suspension of the rules, stating that "some of these bills you have scheduled are of major importance and highly controversial and extremely costly to the American people." p. 16804

SENATE

17. FARM PROGRAM. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 4071, the Senate farm bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. (pp. 16748-59) See Digest 140 regarding provisions of the House Amendment.
18. FARM LABOR. Passed without amendment H. R. 10360, to extend the Mexican farm labor program until June 30, 1961. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 16659
19. LIVESTOCK DISEASES. Passed as reported H. R. 12126, to extend to wild animals the same prohibition against entry into the U. S. as domestic animals from any country where rinderpest or foot-or-mouth disease exists. p. 16661
20. MARGARINE. Passed with amendment H. R. 912, to amend the Navy ration statute to permit the serving of oleo or margarine. pp. 16661-2
21. TEXTILES. Passed with amendments H. R. 469, to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products. (pp. 16720-1, 16725, 16726-45)
Adopted the committee amendments, and an amendment by Sen. Javits, to eliminate language requiring the labeling of the containers of imported textile products (p. 16744).

22. WATER RESOURCES. Passed with amendments H. R. 5497, to authorize Federal assistance for certain fish and wildlife development projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Agreed to two amendments by Sen. Cotton to exclude recreational facilities from the bill. pp. 16716-19
- Passed with amendment H. R. 12216, to designate a dam on the Cumberland River near Carthage, Tenn., as the Cordell Hull Dam, and to establish a U. S. study commission on certain Texas river basins. pp. 16634-5
- Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 585, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies into the feasibility of furnishing water from the Central Valley Project to the counties of Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey, Calif., by way of the Pacheco Tunnel route or other means. This measure will now be sent to the President. p. 16638
- Sen. Neuberger discussed S. 3185, to require the FPC to secure approval by the Secretary of the Interior of any license affecting fish and wildlife resources. He asserted that the amendment proposed by Sen. Morse, to require only that the FPC receive recommendations but not be bound by them, would maintain the present situation in FPC, which, he alleged, "has neither special competence nor special sympathy for conservation goals and methods, when they would militate against construction of a power project." pp. 16622-26
- Sen. Watkins inserted two articles on Russian hydro-power development which asserted that their program was behind schedule, and greater emphasis was now being placed on thermal power generation. pp. 16617-18
- Sen. Johnson discussed the development of Texas' water resources and urged the development of a unified program. pp. 16611-12
23. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment H. R. 8481, to extend title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1956, relating to forestry, to Hawaii. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 16638
- Sen. Humphrey inserted resolutions from the cities of Tower, Eveleth, and Kinney, Minn., urging the appropriation of additional funds for construction projects planned for the Superior National Forest. p. 16613
24. LAND UTILIZATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 12494, to authorize this Department, in selling or agreeing to the sale of certain lands to N. C., to permit the State to sell or exchange such lands for private purposes. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 16638
25. ELECTRIFICATION. Passed without amendment S. 3571, to provide for equal treatment of all State-owned hydro-electric power projects with respect to the taking over of such projects by the U. S. p. 16633
- Sen. Humphrey inserted a resolution from the East River Electric Power Cooperative urging the enactment of S. 2990 and H. R. 11762, to transfer certain REA functions from the Secretary to the REA Administrator. pp. 16612-13
26. RESEARCH. Passed with amendment S. 3268, to provide various amendments to the National Science Foundation Act. pp. 16631-2
27. ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6789, to provide for reasonable notice of applications to the U. S. courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies (S. Rept. 2435). p. 16613
28. FOOD ADDITIVES. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendments H. R. 13254, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to prohibit the use in foods of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety (S. Rept. 2422). p. 16613

these bills. Their enactment would not be in accord with the program of the President.

The Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget object and they say it is not in accord with the program of the President. This bill should be defeated.

Mr. HORAN. On two occasions publicly the CAA Administrator has told me he is not suffering from lack of funds supplied by the subcommittee on which we both serve.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

(Mr. HEMPHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3502, the Federal Airports Extension Act of 1958. This is legislation designed to meet the growing needs of our air age and to continue expansion of airport facilities.

Air travel is increasing. It does not necessarily compete with surface transportation; rather, it supplements surface travel. With a growing population, and with opportunities available often at distant points, air travel is a necessity for some, a convenience for many. We of the Congress recognize this and we encourage the use of airports for our peoples.

I note that the need for airports during the next 4 years is estimated by persons and organizations in the know, at 1138 projects. This does not include those that need funds for facilities.

We need to make air travel immediately available to all who desire it. Airports are a part of the answer. Adequate stops are another. We cannot ask for stops until we have landing facilities sufficient and adequate.

At my own home we have a wonderful airport. We need facilities. I hope we can realize some from this program.

Last year, in another part of my district, funds were made available for an industrial airport.

We want the world to know, down in my part of the country, that we want industry, and we have the people who will give you the best day's work for your money of any people anywhere in the world. You can get a big dollar's worth of honest, dedicated work for your dollar.

In keeping with our invitation to industry and our promise of honest labor I support this legislation.

Let us build and improve our airports. It is a good investment in progress. I hope the legislation will pass.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to all of the debate today and I have been unable to find any basis for opposition to this legislation. If I understand the gentleman from Ohio correctly, his reason for opposing this bill is that he does not want to give the same treatment to the construction of airports that we give to the construction of highways. Apparently, that is his only reason, and I do not think it is a very good one.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to abandon the Federal Airport Construction program, then vote against it today, because that is exactly what you would be doing.

If we want to be unrealistic then we can argue that we will have plenty of time to extend this act next year. It simply is not possible to have a continuous program if we wait until the act expires before we renew it. The Federal airport program is a cooperative program and the communities and the States need to plan ahead for airport construction. If they are to utilize Federal assistance they will have to know in advance what assistance will be available to them. Mr. Speaker, it is highly important that we renew this program prior to the adjournment of this Congress so that these communities can move forward with their plans for airport construction.

Mr. Speaker, the airport situation in our Nation's Capital is a good example of what can happen if we do not adequately consider our needs for the future. Several years ago the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce authorized a second Washington airport. The Secretary of Commerce was opposed to the site selected by Congress and was successful in blocking the development of this airport. I believe this original authorization act was passed by Congress in 1953. We have now waited over 5 years for the development of a second airport for Washington. As a result we have an airport which cannot handle all of today's traffic and it is totally incapable of handling any of the jet traffic which is scheduled to go into service this fall. This should vividly bring home to us the need for a sound program for the development of airports throughout the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to delay on the extension of this act merely because the Secretary of Commerce is opposed to it. We cannot afford to wait 5 years to carry on our airport construction program. We cannot afford inadequate airport facilities which would serve as a hazard to air transportation. We must do everything in our power to promote safety in the air and on the ground and our experience in recent days tragically proves that we have some areas which are served with inadequate facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the extension of the Federal Airport Act is supported by nearly every aviation organization in the country. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If we consider the success of this program and the demands of private and commercial aviation in

the future, we cannot fail to approve this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will look into the future and approve this bill so that we will have adequate airports to serve the greatest system of air transportation in the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 152, noes 42.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 691, Rept. No. 2665), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical needs, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is, disagreed to and a conference is requested with the Senate upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 149—85TH CONGRESS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 679, Rept. No. 2666), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That House Resolution 149, 85th Congress, as amended, is further amended by striking out the first sentence in paragraph 2 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "For such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof as authorized by the chairman is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, within the North American continent, or elsewhere when in connection with any study or investigation of ocean steamship conferences and the dual rate system, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary: *Provided*, however, That in no event shall the chairman designate more than 5 committee members and 2 staff members to proceed outside the United States on any one study or investigation of ocean steamship conferences and the dual rate system."

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, an-

nounced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3776. An act to extend the time for the collection of tolls to amortize the cost, including reasonable interest and financing cost, of the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.; and

S. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to authorize the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to confer a medal on Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9700. An act to consolidate into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12216. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Cumberland River near Carthage, Tenn., as the Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11078. An act to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. PORTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FOOD-STAMP PLAN

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 13067) to provide for the establishment of a food-stamp plan for the distribution of \$1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and dispose in a beneficial manner of food commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Department of Agriculture in carrying out price support operations or diverted from the normal channels of trade and commerce under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation as quickly as possible for the calendar years 1959 and 1960 a program to distribute

to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system such surplus food commodities.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in commercially packaged form, preferably through normal channels of trade;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2 (1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2 (3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this act to a value of up to \$1 billion, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this act, a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, on the feasibility of, the cost of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivors insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this act by reason of section 6 of this act.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I shall speak only briefly about this very important measure because many other Members desire to speak.

I do want to say that we had before our committee 20 or more bills relating to food-stamps. The purpose of this bill now before the house is to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to institute a food-stamp plan designed to accomplish two main objectives:

First. The improvement of the nutritional standards of needy persons in the United States, our own American citizens, and

Second. The disposal of our abundant agricultural commodities acquired by the Federal Government through its price-support operations.

The idea is not new to Members of the House or to the Nation. In years gone by we have had some experience with a food-stamp program. We now are distributing Government-owned foods under a totally inadequate program. But under this program 4,665,000 needy Americans now are receiving surplus foods. The number of such recipients is the greatest since the great depression.

Surplus food distribution virtually ceased after the start of World War II and operated only moderately until 1954. In February, 1954, there were fewer than 100,000 persons receiving surplus food throughout the Nation. The increase since that time has been at a very rapid pace. From less than 100,000 in 1954 the number has risen to 4,665,000 this year.

Following is a table showing the number of recipients in the various States:

Number of persons in family units participating in commodity distribution, June 1958

State:	Recipients
Alabama.....	145,746
Arizona.....	20,765
Arkansas.....	256,436
California.....	15,845
Colorado.....	12,277
Connecticut.....	1,120
District of Columbia.....	28,950
Georgia.....	32,793
Illinois.....	73,366
Indiana.....	95,112
Iowa.....	75,729
Kansas.....	10,080
Kentucky.....	239,345
Louisiana.....	118,266
Maine.....	47,657
Maryland.....	24,885
Massachusetts.....	1,687
Michigan.....	475,526
Minnesota.....	59,962
Mississippi.....	185,713

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 20, 1958
For actions of Aug. 18 and 19, 1958
85th-2d, No. 144

CONTENTS

Administrative orders.....	10	Humane slaughter.....	27	River basins.....	3
Appropriations.....	8,23	Lands.....	30	Saline water.....	22
Building leases.....	13	Legislative program.....	11	School lunches.....	20
Contracts.....	4	Loans.....	33	Small business.....	17
Dairy.....	29	Marketing.....	29	Social security.....	18
Economic situation.....	6,16	Minerals.....	21	Surplus food.....	35
Education.....	14,19,34	Personnel.....	5	Surplus property.....	15
Electrification.....	33	REA.....	33	Water resources.....	7,24
Exports.....	9	Reclamation.....	2	Watersheds.....	26
Farm Census.....	28	Research.....	19	Wheat.....	25
Farm machinery.....	32				
Farm policies.....	16				
Food stamps.....	12				
Foreign trade.....	31				
Forestry.....	1				

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on supplemental appropriation bill.

SENATE - August 19

1. FORESTRY. Agreed to the House amendment to S. 4053, to extend the boundaries of the Siskiyou National Forest, Ore. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 17101
Sen. Murray commended Sen. Neuberger for his work on the passage of the Klamath Indian forest bill, S. 3051, and inserted an editorial on the matter. pp. 17034-5
2. RECLAMATION. Agreed to the House amendments to S. 3448, to exempt the Skeedskadee unit, Colorado River Basin project, from the acreage limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 17035-6
3. RIVER BASINS. Agreed to the House amendments on S. 4021, to establish the U. S. Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Mary's, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Perdido-Escambia River Basins. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 17035

4. CONTRACTS. The Finance Committee reported with amendments H. R. 11749, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, until June 30, 1959 (S. Rept. 2478). p. 16995
5. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9407, to provide additional opportunity for certain employees to obtain career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive service (S. Rept. 2474). p. 16995
6. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sen. Johnson commended the passage of anti-recession measures by Congress, and inserted an editorial stating that the economy seemed to be improving. p. 17060
7. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Johnson urged a planned program to develop Texas' water resources. pp. 17060-1
8. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses received from the President a proposed supplemental appropriation for HEW (\$119.3 million) and Labor (\$70.4 million) for 1959, and for the Post Office Department (\$54 million) for fiscal year 1957 and 1958; to the Appropriations Committees. pp. 16993, 16994 (S. Doc. 117)
9. EXPORTS. Both Houses received from the Commerce Department a report on export control for the second quarter of 1958. pp. 16993, 16995
10. ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS. Began debate on H. R. 6789, to provide for reasonable notice of applications to U. S. courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies. pp. 17125-7
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. A call of the calendar was ordered for today, Aug. 20. p. 16994

HOUSE - August 18 (continued)

12. FOOD STAMPS. The remaining portion of the debate on H. R. 13067, the food stamp plan bill, which was rejected by the House (see Digest 143), appears in the Congressional Record today. pp. 16891-900
13. BUILDING LEASES. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 3142, to extend GSA authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes (H. Rept. 2662). p. 16931
14. EDUCATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for sending to conference H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill. p. 16931
15. SURPLUS PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee issued a report on "importation of foreign excess property" (H. Rept. 2661). p. 16931
16. FARM POLICIES. Rep. Madden discussed "some of the accomplishments and failures of this session of Congress," including farm policy, foreign policy, and domestic economic conditions. pp. 16912-15
17. SMALL BUSINESS. Rep. Evins commended the Congress for the passage of legislation to aid small businesses, and inserted a newspaper article on the subject. pp. 16927-28

HOUSE - August 19

18. SOCIAL SECURITY. Agreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 13549, to increase certain benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 16934-8
19. EDUCATION. Appointed conferees on H. R. 13247, the proposed National Defense Education Act of 1958. pp. 16938-9, 16942-50
Rep. Porter criticized the absence of social scientists from the recent appointments to the National Science Foundation Board, and urged greater research effort into the social sciences. pp. 16986-9
20. SCHOOL LUNCHES. Passed as reported S. 1764, to authorize payment of the cost of free lunches for needy children in the D. C. public schools. p. 16958
21. MINERALS. Began debate on S. 4036, to stabilize the production of minerals by direct payments to producers. pp. 16959-81
22. SALINE WATER. Received the conference report on S. J. Res. 135, to authorize the Interior Department to construct and operate demonstration plants to produce water for consumptive uses from saline and brackish waters (H. Rept. 2764). The Conference Committee deleted the Virgin Islands as a location for a plant, and stated that demonstration plants will be placed in the Northern Great Plains, in the arid Southwest, and one each on the three coasts: Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific. pp. 16981-2, 16993
23. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 13450 (H. Rept. 2677). pp. 16939-41, 16993
Attached is a table reflecting the actions of the conferees as they affect this Department.
The conferees also recommended an appropriation of \$2,830,000 instead of \$2,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,850,000 as proposed by the Senate for the administration of the Ryuku Islands, under the Army Department, with an authorization for the President to transfer any of this work to other Departments.
An item of \$2,915,000 for the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization was reported in disagreement.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

24. WATER RESOURCES. Extension of remarks of Sen. Johnson commending the work of the Lower Colorado River Authority, and inserting an article on this subject. p. A7415
25. WHEAT. Sen. Neuberger inserted an editorial describing the support in Oregon for a two-price plan for wheat. pp. A7422-3
26. WATERSHEDS. Rep. Kee inserted her statement in support of soil and water conservation programs. pp. A7432-3
27. HUMANE SLAUGHTER. Rep. Multer inserted an article favoring passage of the humane slaughter bill and expressing hope that the President will sign it. p. A7438
28. FARM CENSUS. Rep. Hagen inserted an article, "Census Shows Recession Slows Move From Farms." pp. A7439-40

BILLS INTRODUCED

29. DAIRY. H. R. 13800, by Rep. Johnson, to provide for the mandatory price support through March 31, 1962, for milk used in manufactured dairy products and for butterfat; to maintain the productive capacity of our dairy farming industry; to promote the orderly marketing of an adequate national supply of milk and dairy products; to encourage increased domestic consumption of dairy products in the interest of national health and security; to Agriculture Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 16922-5
30. LANDS. H. R. 13802, by Rep. Poage, to amend sec. 7 of the act of August 18, 1941, to provide that 75 percent of all moneys derived by the U. S. from certain recreational activities in connection with lands acquired for flood control and other purposes shall be paid to the State; to validate certain payments; to Public Works Committee.
31. FOREIGN TRADE. H. R. 13805, by Rep. Curtis, Mo., to establish a U. S. Trading Corporation to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world markets; to Foreign Affairs Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 16925-7
32. FARM MACHINERY. S. Res. 384, by Sen. Langer, to make a full and complete study and investigation of the causes of the increased prices of farm machinery, farm equipment, farm trucks, and the necessary replacement parts of the aforementioned; to Judiciary Committee.
33. LOANS: REA. S. Res. 385, by Sen. Langer, to make a full and complete study and investigation of the Comptroller General's holding in a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, dated July 21, 1958 (B-134138), relating to the use of loan funds under the rural electrification program; to Judiciary Committee.
34. EDUCATION. S. 4315, by Sen. Jenner, to authorize the legislatures of the several States to determine whether such States shall participate in programs providing for Federal grants to such States or their inhabitants; to Government Operations Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 17127-9

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

35. SURPLUS FOOD DONATIONS. H. R. 13268, which authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase flour and cornmeal for donation purposes, rather than entering into a contract to have flour and cornmeal milled from grain in the CCC inventory, and authorizes CCC to sell an equivalent amount of wheat and corn to offset such purchases of flour and cornmeal. Approved August 19, 1958 (Public Law 85-683, 85th Congress).

Mr. PERLO. Yes. I didn't show the manuscript to anybody. I didn't show the manuscript to any other house, but I talked to—I was introduced to a couple of people in the publishing field, not the top in their companies—

Senator SMITH. You do not know who they were?

Mr. PERLO. I don't remember.

Senator SMITH. Where were they when you were introduced to them?

Mr. PERLO. Well, I don't know; in offices.

Senator SMITH. Were you in Communist headquarters?

Mr. PERLO. No.

Senator SMITH. Have you ever been in Communist headquarters?

Mr. PERLO. I refuse to answer that on the grounds it might incriminate me.

Senator SMITH. I thought you would. How many other people do you know besides the president of this International Publishers, connected with that outfit?

Senator WELKER. A moment ago you refused to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate you, but Mr. Morris refreshed the witness' memory so he came through on Mr. Trachtenberg. Maybe he will help us a little more.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know James Allen?

Mr. PERLO. I refuse to answer on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Senator SMITH. Do you know who James Allen is?

Mr. PERLO. He's the author of books.

Senator SMITH. He is a Communist, is he not?

Mr. PERLO. I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. You know very well that he is, Mr. Perlo.

Mr. PERLO. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Perlo, in connection with your statement here on page 220, "The U. S. S. R., the Peoples Democracies, and China lead this world struggle for peace," I would like our record to show exactly what countries you mean are leading the struggle for peace. Certainly, the U. S. S. R. is the Soviet Republic. Now, which of the Peoples Democracies?

Mr. PERLO. I want to make clear that this paragraph is referring to all of the forces in the world that are fighting for peace, including not only the Soviet Union, the Peoples Democracy in China, but the peace movement in Western Europe, and in the United States, in Germany, Japan, and in the colonial countries.

Mr. MORRIS. The peace movement is the Communist movement, is it not?

Mr. PERLO. It is not.

Mr. MORRIS. Is the Communist movement in the United States and in Western Germany and in the other countries you have enumerated a force for peace?

Mr. PERLO. I believe it is.

Mr. MORRIS. You say that "the U. S. S. R., the Peoples Democracies, and China lead this world struggle for peace."

Mr. PERLO. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Which of the countries in your struggle for peace do you refer to on page 220?

Mr. PERLO. The Peoples Democracies.

Mr. MORRIS. Which of the Peoples Democracies?

Mr. PERLO. The Peoples Democracies of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania.

Mr. MORRIS. How about North Korea?

Mr. PERLO. I don't know whether that's classified as a Peoples Democracy or not.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you consider the North Korean Government a people's government in the sense that you use it here?

Mr. PERLO. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think China is fighting for peace?

Mr. PERLO. Yes; I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not happen to have any sons over in Korea, do you?

Mr. PERLO. No, but if I had sons over in Korea—

The CHAIRMAN. I doubt if you would still think China as fighting for peace if you had a son in Korea.

Mr. PERLO. Yes. All my resentment would be against those who sent my son over to Korea to die in a senseless war 7,000 miles away from here which is directed against China.

Mr. MORRIS. Then in the rest of the sentence you say "and China," and by China I suppose you mean the Peoples Republic of China headed by Mao Tse-tung?

Mr. PERLO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know who invaded South Korea?

Mr. PERLO. Do I know who invaded South Korea?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; do you know?

Mr. PERLO. Well, I don't know that anybody invaded South Korea. I have seen very powerful evidence indicating the possibility that the shoe was on the other foot.

Senator WELKER. Where did you see that? I want to know, where did you see that powerful evidence?

Mr. PERLO. Where did I see it?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. PERLO. I saw it in various publications.

Senator WELKER. The Daily Worker?

Mr. PERLO. I may have seen some in the Daily Worker.

Senator WELKER. You did see it then; did you not?

Mr. PERLO. I may have seen it in other newspapers as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Peoples World?

Mr. PERLO. No.

Senator WELKER. Tell us any more.

Mr. PERLO. You want to know some more places where I saw evidence of this?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. PERLO. I will refer you to one of the best collections on the subject, which is Mr. I. F. Stone's book on the Secret History of the Korean war, but I want to point out that that by no means is the main question, because, regardless of what happened, the Korean war began as a civil war among Koreans, and I hold firmly to the position that regardless of who started it, the United States had no business going in there, and I think you are well aware of the fact that on more than one occasion Senators speaking on the floor of the Senate have pointed out to this effect and have pointed out that the President sent troops to Korea without declaring war, without consulting Congress, and I raise the question whether you think that by the same logic we should send troops and airplanes to fight in Indochina because the Indochinese have attacked the French in Indochina.

Senator WELKER. You believe in the concepts and principles of the United Nations; do you not?

Mr. PERLO. I certainly do.

Senator WELKER. Did we not owe a duty to the United Nations to go to the help of our fellow member over there when he was invaded by force?

Mr. PERLO. The Charter of the United Nations provides against the intervention of the United Nations in the internal affairs of other countries—

Senator WELKER. How about aggression?

Mr. PERLO. I think it is misuse of the charter.

Senator WELKER. How about aggression?

Mr. PERLO. Aggression within the Charter of the United Nations is an attack by one country on another country.

Senator WELKER. Do you not believe that was aggression and attack on one country by another country?

Mr. PERLO. No; it was a civil war within another country, Korea.

Senator WELKER. Do you want to tell us now: Are you or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PERLO. I refuse to answer for the same reasons.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in view of Mr. Perlo's statements before the Internal Security Subcommittee, it is not surprising that he would seek to discredit "people's capitalism" throughout the world in a period of great tension. I am not surprised at his writings; they are quite in character. However, I am amazed that the American Economic Review could be used to promote such views. Because of the stated desires of the editors to contribute outstanding articles on economic issues, I am at a loss to understand how Mr. Perlo's manuscript was selected for publication.

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical needs; and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HILL, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE—STATEMENTS AND CONFESSIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall undertake to be reasonably brief and comprehensive in my remarks on the pending bill. A splendid record has been laid down through the efforts of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators, all of whom have contributed to the development of this record.

We have come a long way from the days of the thumbscrew and the rack. In man's progress toward enlightenment and a better society, there has constantly been, since Judge Jeffreys and the bloody assizes in England, and even before that time, a movement which has been as inexorable as it has been inspiring in terms of man's humanity to man: that is the protection of the God-given, inalienable right of the individual man and woman in our society.

As I have said before, both the Senator from Colorado and I have had some ex-

perience in the criminal courts. I spent 6 years as a prosecutor, trying cases before juries. Then for a period of 2 years, before I joined the Navy in World War II and after I came out of that war, I was the district attorney of a city of some 2 million metropolitan population.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator said something that I wanted to clarify for the benefit of our friend from Colorado. The Senator from Colorado is a splendid lawyer. Coupled with his ability is a kind and good, a big and generous heart, and a soul full of humanity. I wish to refer to what was said in response to a question of the Senator from Illinois, that perhaps the Senator from Colorado had wanted to get convictions all the time because he was in a prosecuting capacity. I do not believe it. I believe he was the sort of prosecutor some of the rest of us wanted to be and the kind we hope we were, who believes that he represents the defendant as well as the State.

I would call him a good prosecutor. The Senator from Colorado said no monuments are built to prosecutors. The people of Colorado thought enough about the Senator from Colorado to send him to the Senate. Perhaps that action is the semblance of a monument to his conduct when he was in office and had enormous power and great responsibility, with every opportunity to abuse that power, sometimes under the aegis of the law. Therefore I do not believe that the Senator was the sort of prosecutor who believes that the ultimate test of success of a prosecutor is the number of convictions he obtains. I never thought that was the test. I doubt that the Senator from Colorado ever thought so.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARROLL. When I made the comment that monuments are not built to prosecutors, I was referring to the old saying that normally people do not care much for policemen or lawyers or prosecutors. Generally speaking, that is true. The Senator from Missouri said that sending me to the Senate was in the nature of building a monument to me. The task of getting to the Senate is monumental. (Laughter.) However, that does not mean that all of us have statues dedicated to our service in this body. Of course, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. All monuments are not in the form of statues.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. They are in the heart and mind of a man like the Senator from Missouri, who has hope, faith, and charity, as was stated by the Senator from Illinois. I thank the Senator for correcting the Record and for directing the attention of the Senator from Illinois to that statement, so that he may be able to correct the Record.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Illinois did not mean to say it in that context. I was fearful that the Record might be read to mean the contrary. The Senator from Colorado is not the

sort of man who, when invested with authority, would abuse that authority. Nor would he hound people into penitentiaries with manufactured evidence or perjured testimony. Neither would he countenance police brutality, or extract a confession for the sake of building up a record. I wanted to make that perfectly clear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very happy that the Senator from Missouri has paid a deserved tribute to the character of the Senator from Colorado. He is completely correct, of course, in saying that the test of a good prosecutor is not necessarily the number of convictions he obtains.

I remember a case involving Homer Cummings, when he was district attorney in a Connecticut city. Mr. Cummings had obtained an indictment against a man who was about to be convicted. He became convinced however of the man's innocence, and thereupon turned about and had the man acquitted. I always thought that was a noble thing to do.

I know that the Senator from Missouri was one of the best prosecutors in the country. I also know that he, too, placed humanity above conviction.

Mr. HENNINGS. I hope the Senator means criminal conviction, not the other kind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; criminal conviction. It is not true however that the Senator from Missouri obtained convictions in every one of his cases?

Mr. HENNINGS. No, I would not say that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How many cases did the Senator lose?

Mr. HENNINGS. I did not keep track of them. I tried thousands of cases involving murder, bank robberies, rape, and so forth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator did not lose many cases.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is very generous. In prosecuting cases I lost cases that I deserved to lose. The jury brought in verdicts of not guilty in cases in which the juries felt the defendant had not been proven guilty.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator know the ropes in criminal prosecutions, and does he not also know the general practices—and the occasional lapses—of the police?

Mr. HENNINGS. I made something of a study of the subject, because I spent 8 years of my life in the criminal courts buildings of a large city. In that time I had to deal with hundreds of policemen, and, I might add, that most of them were able and conscientious public servants. This was during the gang and prohibition days, from 1929 to 1934, when I was elected to the House of Representatives and left that place. Later I was elected district attorney.

I have always taken an interest in the general field we are discussing, certainly in the matter of prosecution, although I have acted as defense attorney in only a relatively few cases.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Missouri does not need my help to be qualified as an expert on this subject. What I was attempting to do in my clumsy way—

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator has been conducting his examination in a very penetrating manner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I was attempting to do is show that the Senator from Missouri speaks from his intimate and protracted acquaintance of the problems of criminal law and the issues involved in connection with the arraignment and obtaining of confessions from defendants.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator for developing that thesis. I have learned from some experience. That is true of any prosecutor who prepares his cases and who has an effective law enforcement agency such as a police department or, if it be in rural areas, a sheriff and his staff, or, in the Federal domain, the marshals in the old days, and now the FBI.

I do not believe that a competent prosecutor needs any more help than the law affords to convict those who should be convicted of offenses and transgressions against the law.

Congested dockets have always been a problem. However, this is due in large measure to the fact that according to our Constitution, each defendant is entitled to a trial by a jury of his peers. This can be a slow process. However, I have never been one to believe that the rule should be so changed and so weighted as to give the prosecuting authorities any more than they have to work with.

When a prosecutor rises and has the majesty of the government behind him, and after the marshal has intoned at the opening of the court, "God save the United States and this honorable court," and after he reads the indictment, "The grand jurors, assembled, do say upon their oath that the defendant fired a leaden bullet," and after he concludes the reading by saying, "and did steal and murder," there it is: an indictment voted by a grand jury; and there sits the defendant.

True enough, the prosecutor cannot interrogate him if he does not choose to take the stand. True enough, the prosecutor is bound by certain rules of evidence relating to what may be done as respects the defendant in the court. But I say the same rules apply to a police department that apply to a man schooled and learned in the law and of sufficient capacity to occupy a post of public responsibility which deals with the freedom and, indeed, the lives of those whom he must prosecute under his oath of office.

That is why I say that if a prosecuting attorney or a district attorney in a courtroom refers to the fact that a defendant has not taken the stand, he knows when he does so he has committed outright reversible error. So a Federal police officer knows that if he detains a defendant beyond what is called a necessary delay, and a confession is obtained or if a confession is obtained by coercion, promises of immunity or

H. R. 8732. An act for the relief of Ella H. Nafafalusy;
 H. R. 9160. An act for the relief of Genoveva Riosco Caswell;
 H. R. 9851. An act for the relief of Tsuyako Ikeda;
 H. R. 9993. An act for the relief of Miss Mary M. Browne;
 H. R. 10045. An act to provide for the sale of all of the real property acquired by the Secretary of Commerce for the construction of the Burke Airport, Va.;
 H. R. 12256. An act for the relief of Alphonse E. Jakubauskas;
 H. R. 12776. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways";
 H. J. Res. 634. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;
 H. J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 19, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

AUGUST 18, 1958.

The Oath of Office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (22 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 85th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress, entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ERWIN MITCHELL,
Seventh District, Georgia.
 ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
Seventh District, Illinois.
 ALBERT H. QUIE,
First District, Minnesota.
 MILTON W. GLENN,
Second District, New Jersey.
 HOWARD W. ROBISON,
37th District, New York.
 ROBERT N. C. NIX,
Fourth District, Pennsylvania.
 JOHN A. LAFORE, Jr.,
13th District, Pennsylvania.
 JOHN H. DENT,
21st District, Pennsylvania.
 ROBERT A. EVERETT,
Eighth District, Tennessee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2239. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1957, pursuant to the provisions of section 333 of the United States Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2240. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to strengthen the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service through revision and extension of some of the provisions relating to retirement, appointment of personnel, and other related personnel matters, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2241. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the United States Post Office Department cost ascertainment report for the fiscal year 1957, as provided by law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2242. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order granting the application for permanent residence filed by Woo Yung Ploy, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2243. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY: Committee of Conference. S. 607. An act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2657). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE: Committee of Conference. H. R. 1061. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law (Rept. No. 2658). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee of Conference. H. R. 4544. A bill for the relief of Louis S. Levenson (Rept. No. 2659). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Thirty-sixth reprint of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to rocket launcher procurement (Rept. No. 2660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Thirty-seventh reprint of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to importation of foreign excess property (Rept. No. 2661). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 3142. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes; without amendment

(Rept. No. 2662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2117. An act directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain buildings to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 2663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 3949. An act to add certain public domain lands in Nevada to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 691. Resolution providing for sending to conference the bill, H. R. 13247, to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical needs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2665). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 679. Resolution to amend House Resolution 149, 85th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2666). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Thirty-eighth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to false and misleading advertising (Rept. No. 2667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Thirty-ninth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to false and misleading advertising (Rept. No. 2668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 4088. An act to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, Wyoming, and to authorize its execution; without amendment (Rept. No. 2669). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 12858. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2670). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 13794. A bill to amend section 302 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 with respect to the method of foreclosure of mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 13795. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 13796. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 13797. A bill to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession, or use of explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 13793. A bill to correct the inequities of the Postal Field Service Compensation

tion Act of 1955; to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 13799. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a method whereby a decedent's executor or administrator may be discharged from personal liability for all income, estate, and gift taxes due from such decedent or his estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 13800. A bill to provide for the mandatory price support through March 31, 1962, for milk used in manufactured dairy products and for butterfat; to maintain the productive capacity of our dairy farming industry; to promote the orderly marketing of an adequate national supply of milk and dairy products; to encourage increased domestic consumption of dairy products in the interest of the national health and security; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 13801. A bill to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession, or use of explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 13802. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of August 18, 1941, to provide that 75 percent of all moneys derived by the United States from certain recreational activities in connection with lands acquired for flood control and other purposes shall be paid to the State; to validate certain payment; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POLK (by request):

H. R. 13803. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of pay differentials for hazardous em-

ployment for civilian fire fighters employed at installations of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 13804. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the retirement of fire fighters in or under the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 13805. A bill to establish a United States Trading Corporation to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 13806. A bill to authorize construction of a flood-control reservoir on the North Fork of Pound River, Pound, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 13807. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize, in certain cases, the issuance of licenses to non-citizens for radio stations aboard certain vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 13808. A bill to establish a United States Trading Corporation Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 379. Concurrent resolution relative to captive nations days; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 13809. A bill to provide for the payment of relocation expenses to Milo G. and Patricia Wingard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 13810. A bill for the relief of Albert Gordon, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 13811. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Faye E. Russell Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

730. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Wyandotte, Mich., requesting and urging favorable action on H. R. 681 before the adjournment of Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

731. Also, petition of the mayor, Brownsville, Tex., relative to requesting passage of Senate Joint Resolution 135 by the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

732. Also, petition of J. W. Draxler, Iron Mountain, Mich., requesting passage of legislation that will provide all veterans of World War I a pension of \$100 per month, and also requesting passage of the bills H. R. 2201 and H. R. 5408; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

in number. I have certain general observations to make relative to the actions of the Senate and some of the considerations which I understand were involved in connection with the amendments, but before doing so I will summarize and explain briefly precisely what the substantive amendments were in order that Members of the House may be aware of the action which has been taken.

First, I will outline the amendments which were made by the other body to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance provisions of the bill. There were only three substantive amendments to this part of the bill.

First, and most important, under the House-passed bill the benefit increases of 7 percent—with a minimum of \$3—would have been effective for months following the second month following the month of enactment. Under the Senate version, the benefit increases will be effective for January 1959, and the first checks in the increased amounts will go out early in February.

Second, under the House-passed bill provision is made for payment of benefits to a child, if at the time of the worker's death the child was a member of the worker's household, if the child was not being supported by any other person, and if the worker's spouse adopts the child within 2 years after the worker's death. Under the House version there could be a case where the worker had died several years ago and where all of these conditions were met except that the widow has not completed adoption of the child, in which event since the 2 years condition had not been met the child could not receive any benefits. Under the Senate amendment there will be afforded a period of 2 years from the date of enactment of the bill for the qualification of such child. That is, there will be a further opportunity of 2 years from date of enactment for adoption proceedings to be completed. It is my understanding that only a relatively few cases would be affected by this.

Third, the Senate added an amendment the purpose of which is to facilitate the extension of social security coverage to employees of certain municipalities in the State of Maine until July 1, 1960. It is my understanding that only a few hundred teachers in the State of Maine are involved in this amendment.

While the foregoing are the only real substantive amendments to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance provisions of the bill, I should mention that technical amendments were made so as to coordinate this measure with legislative action taken by the Congress several days ago with respect to several minor social security amendments. Inasmuch as no substantive changes are involved, I will not burden this discussion by going into details relative to these technical and conforming amendments. Next, I will explain an amendment which was made to those provisions of the House bill relating to child welfare services.

A Senate amendment provides for the establishment of an Advisory Council

on Child Welfare Services to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare before January 1959, for the purpose of making recommendations and advising the Secretary in connection with the effectuation of that provision of the bill which extends child welfare services to urban areas as well as rural areas. Senator PURTELL, the sponsor of the amendment, explained on the floor that the purpose of this council is to assure that there will be an effective coordination between public agencies and existing voluntary organizations and associations performing services in urban areas. He stated that "Duplication of effort could well result in waste of both money and time to the detriment of all agencies. In order to avert any such situation arising, and to utilize to the fullest extent the existing voluntary agencies and the public agencies now existing or that might well be created or expanded by this program, I suggest that we provide the machinery to help direct and assess the progress of the program initiated by the change in the law." The council is to be composed of 12 members representing public, voluntary, civic, religious, and professional welfare organizations and the public.

Finally, the Senate amended the public-assistance provisions of the bill in several respects.

As may be recalled, under the new formula for assistance expenditures for the aged, blind, and disabled, contained in the House-passed bill, the Federal share would be four-fifths of the first \$30 of the average monthly assistance expenditure as under present law, and the Federal participation in the assistance expenditures made above these maximums, within the ceiling of \$66, would be 50 percent for States whose per capita income was equal to or above the average per capita income for the United States and would range upward to 70 percent for States whose per capita income is below the national average. First, a Senate amendment reduces the range on the variable matching provision from 50-70 percent to 50-65 percent. In other words, the 70 percent was changed to 65 percent. Second, a Senate amendment reduced the maximum matchable payment for the aged, blind, and disabled, the so-called Federal "ceiling," from \$66 to \$65, and the maximum for aid to dependent children recipients from \$33 to \$30. Third, a Senate amendment reduced the Federal share of aid to dependent children payments from five-sixths of the first \$18 to fourteen-seventeenth of the first \$17. It is understood that these three changes would affect savings so as to reduce the estimated cost of the public-assistance formulas from \$288 million in the House version of the bill to \$197 million in the Senate version.

There are three other Senate amendments to the public-assistance provisions of the bill which should be explained.

A provision was included to authorize the establishment of an Advisory Council on Public Assistance, consisting of the Commissioner of Social Security and 12 other members to be appointed by the

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review the status of the public-assistance program in relation to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, the fiscal capacities of the States and the Federal Government, and any other factors bearing on the amount and proportion of the Federal and States' shares in the program. The Council is directed to report its findings and recommendations not later than January 1, 1960, to the Secretary and the Congress.

Second, an amendment was adopted to facilitate payment of public-assistance funds in instances where the recipient is legally incompetent or where, for one reason or another, he is unable to handle his own affairs. This amendment provides that for purposes of title I, IV, X, and XV payments on behalf of an individual, made to another person who has been judicially appointed under the law of the State in which such individual resides, as legal representative of such individual for the purpose of receiving and managing such payments—whether or not he is such individual's legal representative for other purposes shall be regarded as money payments to such individual. It is our understanding that this will give effect to the laws in certain specific States, particularly Texas and Louisiana, which provide for the appointment of a legal representative to receive public-assistance payments in behalf of an incompetent person, even though those State laws do not make this person a general guardian for all other purposes.

Third, a Senate amendment removes from the bill the provision which the House bill contained which would have repealed certain provisions of existing law relating to public assistance to Navaho and Hopi Indians residing on reservations or on allotted trust lands.

The foregoing are the substantive amendments which were made by the other body. The balance of the amendments consist of numerous technical, clerical, and conforming amendments which I need not explain here.

The public assistance provisions in the bill are the result of very careful consideration and study. The new formula is a sound and important improvement in the law. We had the benefit of the best technical advice of the experts from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in developing the new formula and also the best technical advice of the State welfare directors.

Secretary Fleming has indicated that there are three elements in the new formula which greatly improve the program—namely, first, changing the individual matching maximum to an average; second, combining the individual money maximum and the medical care maximum into one figure; and third, relating the Federal grants to the fiscal ability of the States by the use of per capita income.

Secretary Fleming indicated that if the Congress were going to make any changes in the public assistance formula, the one included is the soundest that could be devised.

On several occasions President Eisenhower has recommended that Federal grants be based upon the fiscal ability of the States. He made such a recommendation with respect to vocational rehabilitation and with respect to education. The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which he appointed also has so recommended. Recognizing, however, that there may be some modifications that might be necessary in the proposed public assistance formula, the provision was added, as I have indicated, establishing an advisory council on public assistance for the purpose of reviewing the status of the programs in relation to the insurance program, the fiscal capacities of the States and the Federal Government, and any other factors bearing on the amount and proportion of the Federal and State shares in the public assistance programs.

As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I can say that the committee will give careful consideration to any recommendations made by this council and we will give very careful study to how the new amendments work out both with respect to their effect in the various States and with respect to the Federal legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is sound and meritorious legislation which will be of great benefit to millions of American citizens.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have concurred in the action to have the House agree with the Senate amendments to H. R. 13549, the Social Security Amendments of 1958. While these amendments are 96 in number, they are for the most part of a technical, clarifying, or conforming character.

The principal substantive changes made by the Senate may be summarized as follows:

First. The effective date for the increase in OASI benefit payments would be made applicable with respect to the month of January 1959 instead of the second month following the month of enactment;

Second. OASI coverage for certain State and local employees in the State of Maine would be facilitated;

Third. There would be established an Advisory Council on Child Welfare;

Fourth. The status of a legal representative with respect to a mentally incompetent public-assistance recipient would be clarified;

Fifth. The existing law provisions affecting the Navaho and Hopi Indian Tribes would be restored;

Sixth. There would be established an Advisory Council on Public Assistance; and

Seventh. The public-assistance benefit formulas would be revised so as to reduce the estimated cost to the Federal Treasury.

It is in the interest of expediting the legislative consideration of this bill and insuring its passage to the Congress prior to adjournment that the chairman and I have urged the adoption of this procedure of accepting the Senate amendments. In view of the fact old-age and survivors insurance benefits have not been liberalized since 1954, it is appropriate that the Congress should act at this time to provide the modest increases

contemplated by this legislation. On the subject of public assistance liberalization I am confident that I express the hope of every Member of Congress that the States will act to reflect the additional Federal funds available under this legislation in increased benefits to the genuinely needy of our Nation.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it should be understood that, while the conference report on the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is brought before the House without objection, there is still considerable feeling that this legislation covers certain plans upon which no evidence has been taken as to possibility of abuses with respect to such plans and they should be exempt. It is respectfully suggested that the Committee on Education and Labor should make it their business to conduct hearings with respect to these plans in order to do equity.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION BILL OF 1958

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 691 and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical needs, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is, disagreed to and a conference is requested with the Senate upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief statement since the resolution now before the House is the direct result of my objection, on last Thursday, to the unanimous consent request to send H. R. 13247—the National Defense Education Act of 1958—to conference.

I assure my colleagues that I interposed this objection for no trivial, frivolous, or arbitrary reasons.

My reason for raising the objection was the precise and identical reason that this right of objection is specified in the rules and parliamentary procedures of this House—because our constitutional form of government, in the legislative branch as in the overall system, deliberately provides for checks and balances and deliberately affords the means whereby the minority may invoke, for a brief moment, at least, a sober second thought on the part of the majority.

A government, like an automobile, which has brakes but no accelerator, would be pretty futile. But a government, also like an automobile, which has an accelerator and no brakes would be dangerous and potentially self-destructive. There are some of us in this House—at least 140 Members, judging

from the vote for recommitment of this bill on August 8—who feel that with respect to this issue, at least, there has been entirely too heavy a foot on the accelerator.

At the risk of boresomeness and presumptuousness, I remind my colleagues of the warning I offered during the debate on August 8:

To those of my colleagues who think that by passing this bill they are settling a troublesome issue here today, something that is going to stay settled, I offer this prediction. You are merely starting something, not ending it. You are starting new, incessant, and increasing demands—whetted by the taste of this initial victory—demands for more and more, in terms of new areas and types of Federal activity in this field, in terms of ever larger appropriations, in terms of further assumptions by the Congress and the Federal bureaucracy of critical evaluations and decisions as to the content and methods of education, and in terms of direct Federal control of education.

We already have substantial confirmation of that prediction, delivered in a matter of only 5 days, in the action of the other body on this very legislation.

The Senate version of the bill involves substantially broader provisions. It restores the direct scholarship grants stricken from the original bill by the House. The price tag is raised \$390 million. An amendment was offered in the other body which would have added \$2 billion for school construction. True it was defeated, although it received substantial support. It is a fair question as to how long there can be effective resistance to this and other proposed expansions of Federal aid to education once we set our foot in that path.

I plead for earnest reconsideration before a final, fateful step is taken—a step which commits Congress and the Federal Government to a massive transfer to Washington of the responsibility for financing public education, including elementary and secondary education; a step which also, inevitably, must transfer to Washington critical value judgments with respect to education and hence must transfer to Washington increasing control of education.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution. I do so with the full understanding that defeat of this resolution would be a reversal of action previously taken by this House.

I do not concede that such reversal is impossible of achievement—either through defeat of this resolution or through rejection of the final conference report.

I ask my colleagues one final question: Do you—do we—have even yet, any real comprehension of what is involved, of what is being started, if we enact this legislation?

Do we have any real comprehension of what is involved in pressures for more and more forever after; in terms of increasing federalization of all education; in terms of withering local control and vanishing volunteer support of education; in terms of weakened restraints on educational extravagance, and ultimately even in terms of open challenge to the right to maintain private and parochial education?

I do not presume to answer these questions for my colleagues.

But I did not want this final decision taken without a clear and unequivocal showing in the RECORD for some future reading—a clear and unequivocal showing that someone had raised the questions.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 178]

Bailey	Eberhart	Minshall
Baumhart	Engle	Montoya
Beamer	Friedel	Murray
Belcher	Gordon	Norrell
Blatnik	Gray	Osmers
Blitch	Hale	Pillion
Bosch	Harrison, Nebr.	Powell
Boykin	Hébert	Preston
Brooks, La.	Hillings	Proudy
Brownson	James	Radwan
Buckley	Jenkins	Shelley
Burdick	Jones, Mo.	Shuford
Byrne, Ill.	Kearney	Sieminski
Celler	Kilburn	Sisk
Christopher	Latham	Spence
Clevenger	LeCompte	Teague, Tex.
Coffin	McCormack	Vanik
Colmer	McIntire	Vorys
Cooley	Mason	Williams, N. Y.
Coudert	Michel	Winstead
Dies	Miller, Calif.	Young
Doyle	Miller, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight to file a conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2677)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 26, 37, 39, 46, 47, 49, 53, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 104, 107, 111, 117, 119 and 120.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 13, 19, 27, 30, 32, 41, 43, 44, 45, 51, 52, 55, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 95, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 106,

109, 115, 116, 121, 122, 123 and 124, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,830,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,530,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

"For construction and equipment at laboratories and other installations of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"ALASKA INTERNATIONAL RAIL AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, established by the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 888), as amended, \$40,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 14), including not to exceed \$200,000 for necessary expenses during the current fiscal year of technical services rendered by other agencies, \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$130,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$186,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,397,406,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

"For an additional amount for 'Operation and Maintenance, General', \$70,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"LOAN PROGRAM

"For an additional amount, \$4,203,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 7, 9,

14, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 36, 40, 42, 48, 50, 56, 58, 62, 65, 85, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 112, 113, 114, 118, 125, and 126.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
C. W. VURSELL,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House,

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLAN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate,

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Agricultural Research Service

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$3,500,000 for plant and animal disease and pest control instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion which will provide \$500,000 additional for the contingency fund to be used to meet a recent infestation of pink bollworm in the Southwest. In order to establish a long-range program for permanent eradication of this pest, the Departments of State and Agriculture are requested to undertake negotiations with Mexico to establish a cotton-free zone along the United States-Mexican border to prevent its spread between the two countries.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$1,750,000 for meat inspection as proposed by the House instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Soil Bank Programs

Amendment Nos. 4 and 5: Appropriate \$279,450,000 for the acreage reserve program as proposed by the Senate instead of \$275,000,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize \$19,050,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,500,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER II

Department of Commerce

Civil Aeronautics Administration

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$11,735,000 for operation and regulation as proposed by the House instead of \$12,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in disagreement.

Maritime Activities

Amendment No. 8: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate to provide an additional \$25,000 for salaries and expenses.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate language. The con-

ferrees are in full agreement that these funds shall not be continued available for any purpose other than the payment of benefits to disabled seamen and shall be finally rescinded on June 30, 1959.

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No. 10: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate to increase the limitation on general administrative expenses by \$550,000.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 11: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate to provide an additional \$262,000 for expenses.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$186,000 for plant and equipment as proposed by the House instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Related agencies

Amendment No. 13: Inserts headings.
Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER III

Department of Defense—military functions
General Provision

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER V

Department of the Army—Civil functions
Administration, Ryukyu Islands

Amendment Nos. 17 and 18: Appropriate \$2,830,000 instead of \$2,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,850,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorize \$1,530,000 for administrative and information expenses instead of \$1,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI

General Government matters

Executive Office of the President

Executive mansion and grounds

Amendment No. 19: Inserts chapter number and headings.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

Amendment No. 21: Inserts heading

Amendments Nos. 22 through 25: Reported in disagreement.

Corregidor—Bataan Memorial Commission

Amendment No. 26: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate to provide \$46,000 for administrative expenses.

CHAPTER VII

Independent offices

Amendment No. 27: Changes chapter number.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$5,200,000 for operating expenses, Public Buildings Service instead of \$3,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Housing Administration

Amendment No. 30: Provides \$100,000 for administrative expenses and not to exceed \$4,500,000 for nonadministrative expenses as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$300,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$461,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Amendment No. 32: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$5,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$50,000,000 for research and development instead of \$70,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$25,000,000 for construction and equipment instead of \$47,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Reported in disagreement.

National Science Foundation

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$4,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans Administration

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$5,000,000 for general operating expenses instead of \$4,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,269,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate which would appropriate \$450,000 for grants to the Republic of the Philippines.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VIII

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 41: Changes chapter number.

Departmental Offices

Office of Saline Water

The conferees are in agreement that the amount provided is solely for the planning and construction of pilot plants and improvement and operation of the test facility near Port Orange, Fla.

Office of Minerals Exploration

Amendment No. 42: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to appropriate \$4 million for salaries and expenses. The conferees are in agreement that participation by the Federal Government in exploration project contracts should not exceed 50 percent of the actual project cost. In addition, emphasis should be placed on providing exploration assistance on those strategic and critical minerals and metals for which there is a serious shortage in the United States. Not to exceed \$900,000 of the amount provided shall be available for administration and technical services. In addition, not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available from the borrowing authority funds of the Office of Defense Mobilization for administering liquidation of contracts in force.

Office of Oil and Gas

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$18,500 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$885,000 for management of lands and resources as proposed by the Senate instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$4,000,000 for road construction and maintenance (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are in agreement that the 1959 contract authorization shall be carefully programmed to provide a balanced program throughout the current fiscal year without any advance from the 1960 authorization and expect that the obligation authority remaining under the 1959 contract authorization will be apportioned accordingly.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$1,500,000 for surveys, investigations, and research as proposed by the House instead of \$2,483,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$1,250,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources as proposed by the House instead of \$1,350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 48: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 49: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would provide an additional \$200,000 for construction. The conferees are in agreement that \$100,000 for acquisition of lands in connection with the Civil War Centennial Celebration, and \$100,000 for construction of facilities, in the event S. 765 is enacted into law, at the International Peace Garden, North Dakota, shall be made available from existing funds.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to appropriate \$8,000,000 for construction (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the 1959 contract authorization shall be carefully programmed to provide a balanced program throughout the current fiscal year without any advance from the 1960 authorization and expect that the obligation authority remaining under the 1959 contract authorization will be apportioned accordingly.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 51: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$125,000 for management and investigations of resources as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$675,000 for construction.

Related agencies

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$40,000 for salaries and expenses, Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, instead of \$240,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Historical and memorial commissions

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$20,000 for the Boston National Historic Sites Commission as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates \$350,000 for the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission instead of \$142,000 as proposed by the House and \$642,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IX

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 59: Changes chapter number. Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration.

Amendment No. 60: Provides that \$14,200,000 shall be available as a contingency fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House. The managers on the part of the House and the Senate are agreed that an average of 2,500,000 insured unemployment shall be used as the base in determining the availability of contingency funds for use by the States.

*Department of Health, Education, and Welfare**Gallaudet College*

Amendment No. 61: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$34,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Howard University

Amendment No. 64: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 65: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 66: Appropriates \$396,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Education

Amendment No. 67: Inserts heading.

Assistance for School Construction

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$50,000,000 of which \$200,000 is for necessary

expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies instead of \$60,150,000 of which \$250,000 would be for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies as proposed by the Senate.

Payments to School Districts

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$130,000,000 instead of \$149,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates \$186,500 instead of \$316,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 71: Strikes heading proposed by the Senate.

Assistance to States, General

Amendment No. 72: Deletes appropriation of \$1,000,000 for grants to schools of Public Health proposed by the Senate.

Military Pay Increases

Amendment No. 73: Deletes heading proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 74 through 81: Delete appropriations for military pay increases under eight appropriation items totaling \$634,000 proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X

Legislative branch

Amendment No. 82: Changes chapter number.

Senate

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates \$102,160 for committee employees as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 85: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment Nos. 86, 87, and 88: Appropriate \$83,000 for inquiries and investigations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 89 and 90: Reported in disagreement.

House of Representatives

Amendment No. 91: Reported in disagreement.

Architect of the Capitol

Amendment No. 92: Reported in disagreement.

Library of Congress

Amendment No. 93: Reported in disagreement.

General Provisions

Amendment No. 94: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XI

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendment No. 95: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 96: Appropriates \$2,397,406,000 for operating expenses instead of \$2,375,972,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,418,840,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the full budget estimate of \$680,000,000 shall be allocated to the raw materials program and that the reduction below the Senate figure be allocated by the Atomic Energy Commission to other programs under this heading.

Amendment Nos. 97 and 98: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates \$249,929,000 for plant acquisition and construction as proposed by the Senate instead of \$229,429,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XII

*Public works**Department of Defense—Civil Functions*

Amendment Nos. 100 through 103: Insert chapter number and headings.

Amendment No. 104: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$1,925,000 for construction of rivers and harbors and flood control projects.

Amendment No. 105: Appropriates \$70,000 for operation and maintenance, general, rivers and harbors and flood control projects as proposed by the Senate.

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 106: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 107: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$2,500,000 for construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation.

Amendment No. 108: Appropriates \$4,203,000 for the loan program, Bureau of Reclamation as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XIII

Department of State

Amendment No. 109: Changes chapter number.

Administration of Foreign Affairs

Amendment No. 110: Appropriates \$550,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$450,000 as proposed by the House and \$650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 111: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$200,000 for international contingencies. The Department is authorized to proceed with arrangements for holding the Twelfth Session of the International Civil Aviation Organization in the United States.

United States Information Agency

Amendment Nos. 112, 113, and 114: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XIV

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 115: Changes chapter number.

United States Secret Service

Amendment No. 116: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 117: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$54,000 for salaries and expenses, White House Police.

Amendment No. 118: Reported in disagreement.

Coast Guard

Amendment No. 119: Appropriates \$150,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvements as proposed by the House instead of \$399,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Post Office Department

Amendment No. 120: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate which would appropriate \$29,500,000 to the Postal Modernization Fund. The managers on the part of both Houses agree that the Department should continue the contract engineering staff, associated with modernization projects, out of available funds.

CHAPTER XV

Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments

Amendment No. 121: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 122: Inserts reference to Senate Document.

Amendment No. 123: Appropriates \$14,223,316 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,523,895 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XVI

General provisions

Amendment No. 124: Inserts chapter number and heading.

Amendment Nos. 125 and 126: Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
C. W. VURSELL,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION BILL OF 1958

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to do something rather unusual; rise and speak against this conference on the education bill. We have already notice from the other body that it proposes in almost every title of this education bill, especially under scholarships and under loans, enormous funds beyond what the House passed. You may remember, of course, that we cut out the scholarship fund entirely. The other body has put it back and added \$50 million for 4 years. That is \$50 million over and above the original House bill which we eliminated entirely from the bill by a substantial vote under the Judd amendment.

In title II the other body provided that more loans may be given, and then they have an elaborate system of forgiveness. The other body has a provision that if the students cannot pay back these loans, they may be forgiven by the Commissioner of Education. It looks as if that might run as high as \$80 million or \$100 million a year of forgiveness, for 4 years. How we can ever agree with the other body on their new proposals is difficult to see. It would be better to deny the conference and wait for 4 months, as we argued yesterday on many items and start in again to understand this education bill in January 1959.

It is obvious that the Members understand very little about the testing program provided for in this bill at a cost of something like \$80 million over a 4-year period. Testing itself is a questionable art. The possible damage to children is of concern to the parents and many educators.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Before the gentleman proceeds to discuss the tests, I wonder if the gentleman will state that the effect of a "No" vote on the pending resolution would be to keep the bill from the conference, would be to kill the bill.

Mr. GWINN. If the vote is "No" on this conference, then, of course, there would be no bill this year, and it would wait over until next year.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GWINN. On one item alone I think it has become perfectly clear in the last few days that we ought to delay action on this bill. That is the item of \$80 million for testing. Let me show you what happens when the Federal Government gets into testing the psychology, the aptitude, the qualifications of our children according to some educators' idea of their qualifications. Here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 13, in a speech by Senator GOLDWATER, is included the questions in a typical test published by the Science Research Testing Board. A copy of the test was secured from the United States Office of Education by Senator GOLDWATER.

These questions are so personal that the teachers are telling the children who take the tests that they ought not to discuss these tests with their parents.

Let me give you a few of the questions that are being asked our children. The questions and the answers are filed in a personal file under the name of the pupil taking the test with all the comments of the testers, advisers, and so forth. The envelope in later years may come up to plague the child or the grown man or woman. They constitute a part of his or her permanent record. Often they are most uncomplimentary.

The child is supposed to answer "Yes" or "No" in the column opposite such questions as these.

I don't like people.
People don't like me very much.
I am afraid of people.
The kids pick on me.
Nobody likes me.
I wish people would let me alone.
People hurt my feelings.
I don't like reading, writing, or history.
I can't read very well.
I can't write very well.
I can't spell very well.
I can't do arithmetic very well.
I am afraid of tests.

So are we.

I don't like teachers.
Teachers don't like me.
I'd like to be a boy.
I'd like to be a girl.
I'm afraid of the doctor.
I'm afraid of the dentist.
I'm afraid of the dark.
I wish we had more money.
I wish we had a nice house.
I don't like my home.
I wish I didn't have a brother.
I wish I didn't have a sister.

And so on. Here are some others:

I have thought of suicide.
I don't feel I belong in the family.
I wish my father had a higher level of job.
I'm sometimes ashamed of my family.
I wonder if I am normal in my sex development.
How far should high-school students go in love relations?
I'm losing faith in religion.
Is it wrong to deny the existence of God?

If we should read that the Russians were specializing in and making these questions a part of the routine in their educational program, we would say it was positive and conclusive evidence of the degradation of a pagan society. I wonder if the Russians may be this very morning reading about our deliberations on our educational system here. We have had no sufficient deliberations on this testing. We do not know what is involved except that the Federal Government is getting behind it in a big way with millions of dollars to make more of it in our school systems instead of less.

Let us go to sleep on this one and wake up in 4 months and take another look at this whole educational program, and deny this conference.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out some examples of how the local industrial and educational communities go to work voluntarily to meet educational needs. If the Government would only stay out of our communities and let them function and let them keep the re-

sponsibility for their education and for their children it would be much better. How much more sensible it is to read of the examples of self-government and responsible management of a free people on their own communities referred to by Robert L. Clark below, instead of the Federal Government's solutions proposed for and on behalf of the people by such legislation as this before us. Mr. Clark is executive director of the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers. He has made a survey of the local efforts to improve our educational system. It is an interesting story. Mr. Clark says:

The committee has come to believe that the solutions for the most pressing problems of shortage are to be found at the local level. Any evidence, therefore, of serious industry—education collaboration such as is evidenced here is most encouraging to us.

We have recognized, of course, that there are many facets of the total problem, not all of which involve the elementary and secondary schools. For instance, with the current shortage situation as acute as it is, there is need for the full conservation of the existing scientific manpower resources. We have programs in operation that will help, we hope, to make this fuller use of available manpower. We are concerned, too, with the impending load which is about to hit the colleges and universities with the increasing college-age population that some of you, as secondary school educators, have brought up to their doors.

Basically, however, the success of the Nation's activities lies in the continuation and expansion of the kinds of programs you have undertaken in Southern California—community programs broadly conceived and effectively executed.

There is no substitute for local action in the United States, particularly in matters concerned with education and the school systems. But the integration of many local efforts across the country will achieve a national impact on the national problem.

The objective of the President's Committee is to develop a pattern for national effort without sacrificing the incentives and benefits of creative local action.

The citizens of America are aroused as never before to the urgency of this problem. In community after community across the Nation, industrial, professional, civic and labor groups are attempting to do something about it. But in the anxiety to solve the problem, I urgently implore community leaders not to smother our schools under a burdensome and confusing barrage of uncoordinated good intentions.

Every community has a diversity of resources for local action. They can be most effective when they are welded into a close-knit group, moving together, toward a common community objective, for our present national shortage of scientists and engineers can ultimately be solved only in the local classroom. In this situation, the resources for action include the school systems, industry and labor, the chamber of commerce and other industrial and business associations, local chapters of the professional societies, civic and educational organizations.

Many effective local programs predate the existence of the President's Committee. And one of the Committee's chief functions is to serve as clearinghouse for assembling and documenting local experiences, finding new ideas and uncovering new experiments, and making all these available to newly developing local programs. It is hoped that this will accelerate action to meet the problems which are growing ever more acute. You educators know about the growing number of students and the shortage of

teachers. You in industry know of the continually growing demand for technically trained manpower.

Grassroots community action doesn't simply ignite by spontaneous combustion. It must grow out of a need which stirs somebody to action. Sometimes it results from the initiative and enthusiasm of an individual. Sometimes it is initiated by a public-spirited business concern. In other cases local programs are generated by the schools, the service clubs, or the professional societies.

However it happens, it demonstrates a recognition of community responsibility. And a recognition that in the long term, the critical needs of the Nation will be met at the local level—by action in the cities and towns of America.

I would like to talk to you briefly about how regional and community groups across the Nation are accepting their responsibility in this field. The Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce has, I believe, best summed up this responsibility of the local community in a message sent to its members:

"Obviously, we can't, here in Indianapolis, solve the whole problem. But we can solve it in our own area—and thereby contribute to a national solution."

Some of the more successful of these experiments will be detailed for you during this conference. I would like, therefore, to illustrate for you the variety of effort and then indicate what—from our experience—seem to be important elements for their success.

The Indianapolis program to which I alluded a moment ago, is an outstanding example of the way industry can take the lead in generating community action. Indianapolis is an industrial community of some 1,100 business establishments supporting a population of nearly 700,000 people. The shortage of scientists, engineers, and technicians was felt early in Indianapolis. And Mr. E. B. Newhill, general manager of the Allison Division of General Motors, saw the pinch reflected on his own production lines.

On May 4, 1956, Mr. Newhill called on school administrators and science and mathematics teachers of the Indianapolis area to meet with representatives of the city's leading industries. Out of that meeting was born an "Industry-Schools Committee on Science and Mathematics Education."

The committee posed a number of searching questions about the area's schools. The Allison firm employed a group of Indianapolis science and mathematics teachers during the following summer to work out some of the answers. At the same time, the Indianapolis newspapers were stimulating public interest in the problem. By the time schools opened in the fall, representatives of every segment of Indianapolis life were enthusiastically taking part in a community-wide project which soon produced these concrete actions:

The Indianapolis school commissioners appropriated an additional \$56,000 for portable laboratory demonstration tables and other equipment for the junior high schools. An extensive program of inservice education was established for junior high school science teachers.

A program of visits to local industrial plants and laboratories was set up for science students and teachers.

The chamber of commerce raised \$10,000, making it possible for local science teachers to attend national and regional conferences, and to take refresher courses at Purdue University. The chamber also financed participation by outstanding Indianapolis students in the national science talent search.

The chamber of commerce arranged summer employment in local industries for science and mathematics teachers.

A series of seminars in the sciences was held during the school year to hear out-

standing speakers provided by Purdue University. Attendance was limited to science and mathematics teachers, industrial personnel, and selected students.

Experimental television programs were launched for junior high school science students, followed up and evaluated by written examinations.

These are short-term programs. Perhaps most important from the long-range viewpoint, is that the citizens of Indianapolis, who had long suspected they were short-changing their school system found that, when subjected to critical study, science and mathematics education was seriously deficient. The entire system is now being modified to meet the special needs of today's increasingly technological world.

The program of the International Paper Co.—an outstanding example of industry action—reaches into nine States, but it remains a program of community action. The International Paper Co. foundation is aiding the local school systems of 13 communities in 5 southeastern and 4 northern States. Chief objective is to awaken communitywide interest in public-school improvement through a flexible approach that differs according to the needs of each community and is guided by a policy of non-interference with school authorities.

The foundation first gathered the facts with the help of experts from Columbia University and Alabama Polytechnic Institute. Each community program was then developed after consulting with local school authorities on local needs.

Last summer, the foundation financed 2 6-week workshops in math and science instruction for 64 teachers from 44 schools. In a followup survey, the foundation found that the workshops had paid off in these ways:

Science fairs were held in schools for the first time.

Local school systems provided more equipment and teaching materials.

Class teaching practices were improved.

Local summer workshops were set up for teachers.

Teachers in fields other than science and mathematics have requested similar workshops.

This year the summer workshop plan, which is only part of International Paper's overall program, is being expanded to include 75 teachers and administrators from 15 school systems in 6 southeastern States. International Paper last year spent more than \$100,000—a figure which will probably be doubled this year.

I think it pertinent to quote John Hinman, chairman of the board of International Paper, who earlier this year told the National Citizen's Council for the Public Schools:

"Ours is far from being a proven program. But I think we have established that it is quite possible and practical for industrial citizens to stand beside individual citizens in support of their public school systems. * * * We think that the broad pattern that is being worked out in our communities may suggest patterns and avenues that other companies may develop."

In Kansas City, Mo., a single individual was the "spark plug" of the local program: Dr. Max Thornton, technical director of the Midwest Research Institute. After a somewhat discouraging experience as manager of the city's science fair last year, Dr. Thornton resolved that something had to be done to improve science and math teaching. He organized Science Pioneers, Inc., supported by local corporate subscription.

Today, the students of 350 elementary and 35 high schools in the Kansas City area are benefiting from the guidance of Science Pioneers, which operates on an annual budget of \$18,000, a third earmarked for science fairs. A former Kansas City teacher, Leo J. Roedl, is executive director. He main-

tains a speakers' bureau and renders counseling service to teachers and students, assisted by a large corps of volunteers.

In Washington, D. C., where 20,000 scientists and engineers are centered in Government and private research, the professional societies took the lead in stimulating community action. In 1949 the Washington Academy of Sciences, representing 20 local scientific bodies, formed a "Committee for the Encouragement of Science Talent." The committee was at first chiefly concerned with science fairs and the science talent search. The Council of Engineering and Architectural Societies, representing another 20 professional organizations, developed a similar interest in 1953. Two years ago they combined forces to establish a "Joint Board for Science Education" which is now working with 125 public, private and parochial secondary and elementary schools in the Washington area.

Financed by local industry, the joint board's activities include a speakers' bureau, free use of films on engineering as a career, cash awards to outstanding science teachers, and a school contacts committee, with a scientist serving as liaison officer with each secondary school in the area. Of particular interest is a series of career guidance conferences for high school students conducted last year. Outstanding leaders in each field of sciences and engineering served as speakers and advisers. The joint board has also arranged on 3 occasions for as many as 750 scientists and engineers to substitute in the classroom for teachers while the teachers attended national and regional professional meetings.

Another enterprising community in which professional groups are helping school authorities in Shreveport, La. In this Deep South city, a program with 55 secondary and 102 elementary schools has been underway for nearly a year. Claude N. Valerius, a consulting petroleum geologist, persuaded representatives of 24 scientific and professional organizations to join with educational authorities and the Academy of Science in forming the Science Education Council. An interesting feature of this plan is the employment of a part-time administrative staff. Another is the inclusion of medical organizations as very active participants.

In addition to providing career guidance for students and promoting science fairs and clubs, the council finds summer employment for qualified students and maintains a lending library of teacher aids for classroom use. This summer the council is presenting a series of 13 educational programs over a Shreveport television station. Panels of scientists to discuss scientific education are being organized now for PTA meetings next year.

In North Carolina, educators themselves took the lead in improving the State's science and mathematics teaching, which they were the first to recognize as inadequate. A statewide conference at Duke University last year resulted in the appointment by Gov. Luther Hodges of a permanent "Committee on Science and Mathematics Educations," which is cooperating with the President's committee in a "pilot project" expected to produce a pattern adaptable to the needs of other States across the country.

The program is now principally supported by funds originating in the State, with professional societies and North Carolina industry actively cooperating. One novel feature is a system of "science circuit-riders"—traveling teachers who spend several days in each school to work with the local teachers in motivating students with the highest potential and with clear scientific aptitude to consider careers in science and engineering.

I have cited these community programs as typical of differing approaches which are operating successfully in various parts of

the country. The list is by no means all-inclusive. For example, as I mentioned earlier, I have refrained from touching upon the programs being carried on by industry in the State of Oklahoma through the Frontiers of Science Foundation, and by the Mid-Hudson Advisory Council in New York. Nor have I talked of the activities of the Hughes Aircraft Co., in the Los Angeles area. These programs are being discussed by other speakers. However, I would like to mention briefly a few other areas in which significant progress is being made.

In Pennsylvania, Dr. H. A. Neidig, chairman of the chemistry department at Lebanon Valley College, initiated a program to improve chemistry teaching. His program now reaches the students of 42 high schools in 3 neighboring counties. The college campus serves as a center for experiments by high school science clubs and discussion groups for chemistry teachers. The program, jointly sponsored with the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, is especially effective in this predominantly rural area.

Teaching in all public high schools in the area surrounding Buffalo, N. Y., is benefiting from the activities of the Niagara Frontier, which is sponsored and financed by 40 local industries with the cooperation of the American Chemical Society. It features an in-service training program for teachers, for which they receive two units of post-graduate credit from the State Education Department. The program, launched in 1954, also provides special out-of-school training for students with the highest science potential.

In Massachusetts, the firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc., organized the "Lexington Plan" in 1956, under which an industrial concern and a high school jointly hire recent graduates in a technical field. These graduates alternate between teaching and professional work for 3 years. As a result, young people who might otherwise not enter teaching are enabled to enter the profession by increasing their income during early teaching years. The Raytheon Company and Sylvania operate modified forms of this plan.

Providing summer employment for teachers to supplement their income and experience has become a major project—industry cooperating with educational authorities—in virtually every major community in the country and in a great many smaller towns as well. In some cities summer employment is also being provided the ablest high school students. In each case an attempt is made to assure that the nature of employment contributes to the education or professional development of the teacher or student.

Proof that the program is working is found in the increasing number of such cooperative plans. For example, a recent survey of nearly 100 major companies by the National Science Teachers Association shows that 94 percent employ teachers during the summer on a regular or part-time basis. The total number of such programs has increased five times in the past 7 years. Summing up the usefulness of the program to industry, J. C. Sander of Boeing Aircraft says simply and succinctly: "The teachers pay their way."

In the Toledo, Ohio, area, the Chamber of Commerce holds annual exchange days, when teachers visit nearby plants and firms and, in turn, play host to industrial and business people visiting schools. Both groups acquire a closer understanding of the other's problems.

Business and industry in Georgia pay the expenses and fees of 25 nationally-known consultants to the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service, which strives to improve teaching methods. They give an "Oscar" to an outstanding teacher.

The excellent and varied programs of the Albuquerque, N. Mex., school system—particularly in science and mathematics education—sparkplugged by that imaginative and devoted teacher, Dr. E. R. Harrington—and attributable in part to heavy support from local industry.

The aircraft division of Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company gives summer assignments to most of the science and mathematics teachers in the school system of Litchfield, near Phoenix, Ariz. Each year, Goodyear sends half the teachers to the University of Arizona for refresher courses, employing the other half directly in technical work. The following year, the groups reverse roles.

Boeing Aircraft in Seattle, Wash., maintains close liaison with the school system and with the Universities of Seattle and Washington, hiring engineering and scientific faculty for summer work.

Each of these programs has its individual characteristics. Each was developed to meet a local need, using the resources at hand. Each brings together and uses, in its own way, the community forces for action.

The President's committee is not seeking any kind of uniformity in its encouragement of local action. There are great advantages in the variety of programs that are being tested over the United States. The committee recognizes that it is embarked on a new venture in national-local cooperation. The committee is unique and experimental in its assignment from the President to stimulate action by others, rather than to carry out programs of its own. Consequently the committee is intensely interested in all types of community programs. The committee hopes to serve as a clearinghouse for information on the scientific manpower shortage, a focal point for the exchange of tested ideas and experiments.

More important than all this, however, is the fact that in the President's committee for the first time these forces in America which are in a position to take effective action are working together in a concerted attack on the problem of developing an adequate supply of high quality scientific and engineering personnel.

I have described this morning some unilateral and some multilateral approaches to the local problem. They are all first-rate endeavors. Now we are looking ahead to the next steps and to the joining of forces. What should we keep in mind?

The President's committee has come to some conclusions, based on our experiences and on the observation of local programs over the country. Here are at least the basic elements we have come to believe are essential to a successful local program:

1. Broad representation of all forces for community action: Bring together not only the schools, industry and the professional societies, who have an obvious direct concern, but the labor unions, civic groups, neighboring colleges and universities, State education agencies, and the newspapers and radio-television stations. All these are valuable resources for community action.

2. A single approach to the schools: Classroom teachers and school authorities are besieged with many demands upon their time. Get the support of the very people you are trying to help by making one contact with the schools through your community group. Have a year-round liaison representative assigned to each school in the district. Find out how your school system goes about developing its programs. Your efforts can easily break down if there are multiple approaches to the schools from different groups.

3. A close-knit organization with good communications: Plan your organization with clear-cut assignments to its constituent members. Set up good communications through a periodic newsletter or bulletin

which keeps the members informed, provides a continuing report on activities, and records progress toward program goals.

4. Individuals who are willing to work and carry through to final objectives: A key element in any community organization is a "sparkplug" who is willing to work himself and—very important—has the organizing ability and enthusiasm to get others to work as well.

5. An office with a fixed mailing address and telephone as the coordinating mechanism: An office provides the focal point for action. It should provide central services such as a speakers bureau, publication of the newsletter, a repository for films, publications, exhibits and equipment on loan.

6. Maintain an open door for other individuals or organizations interested in your objectives: After getting the program underway, you may find interested individuals or organizations who have not previously participated. They may want to join you on a permanent basis or they may have special skills for carrying through a special project. The local medical society or the newspapers and radio-television stations are examples.

7. And finally—look ahead to the time when your local efforts may be the basis for moving to a State organization, when other communities will join with you in a statewide effort: An organization plan, program goals and methods, and other records will be of great help in guiding the organization of a State or other community programs.

The cooperative organization I have suggested to you will, in general, follow the lines and the activities of our own Presidential Committee. We are an organization of some 20 autonomous national organizations operating in different areas but with a common concern, and sharing a common responsibility. As the President's Committee provides leadership in meeting on a national basis the problems of scientific and technological manpower, so your local organization will provide leadership in the community.

The message of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce to its members sums up, I believe, the contribution of all community programs. It is worth quoting to you again:

"Obviously, we cannot, here in Indianapolis, solve the whole problem, but we can solve it in our own area—and thereby contribute to a national solution."

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to what is going on in a typical example in my own neighborhood to improve science and to find science teachers:

An unusually well-integrated program, with a number of community groups providing service on a broad front to local school systems in four New York counties. All efforts are of a volunteer nature. The budget is small.

1. Origin:

(a) In 1954 the Texaco Research Club, of Beacon, N. Y., sponsored a program of talks and demonstrations to assist science teachers in 4 schools in the area.

(b) At the same time the mid-Hudson section of A. S. M. E. arranged talks on engineering and panel discussions on engineering careers.

(c) Mid-Hudson section of A. C. S. had its manpower committee meet with 10 local chemistry teachers. In September 1955 met again with all the chemistry teachers in the area and arranged to have a liaison scientist work with each teacher.

(d) In October 1955 the 3 groups met, decided to pool resources and make only 1 approach to the schools.

(e) Monthly committee meetings were held during the winter of 1955.

(f) In spring of 1956 the mid-Hudson Council was formally organized, with 7, and later 9, affiliated groups.

2. Basis of program: A felt need for integrated community effort. A. C. S. called a meeting of 10 high-school teachers of the area, who made suggestions concerning their needs. Other needs have arisen as the program progressed.

3. Objectives:

(a) "To make conveniently available to teachers the science resources of the surrounding area.

(b) "To provide a single contact with the schools, thus avoiding multiple visits by a variety of different organizations."

4. Geographic area: A group of communities including Poughkeepsie, Kingston, Beacon, Port Jervis, and other nearby towns in four counties of southeastern New York State.

5. Schools: About 40 secondary schools and some elementary schools.

6. Organization:

(a) Council is made up of representatives from 9 citizen's groups including 5 engineering societies, 1 chemistry society, 2 business groups, 1 professional science club.

(b) Incorporated under the laws of the State of New York.

(c) Executive committee of 11 members with at least 1 from each group.

(d) General meetings several times yearly; executive committee meets monthly.

(e) Current officers are:

Chairman: Dr. Donald S. Allen, chairman of division of natural science, State University Teachers College, New Paltz, N. Y.

Secretary treasurer: Dr. Harry C. Becker, Texaco Research Center, Beacon, N. Y.

Publicity director: James O'Neill, Daystrom, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

7. Activities: The executive committee assigns and supervises the following tasks:

(a) Maintain with each school a liaison representative who knows the school staff; coordinated by liaison training program, with 50 liaison scientists headed by Mr. Ambrose Kennedy.

(b) Publish a monthly newsletter to keep liaison scientists and schools informed of activities and of the services available. Prepared by Dr. George B. Hatch of the Texas Co., Beacon, N. Y.

(c) Provide panel speakers for career conferences and meetings.

The service is coordinated by Francis Stern-Montagny, IBM, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

(d) Provide individual counseling for students.

(e) Provide information and guidance on available scholarships and loans. Directed by Harry Allred, Texas Co., Beacon, N. Y.

(f) Organize tours to laboratories and plants, with counseling provided by the trip guides.

(g) Provide assistance to students on Science Fair projects when requested.

(h) Furnish assistance to science clubs.

(i) Provide summer employment service for teachers and students. About 10 teachers employed in summer of 1956.

(j) Furnish information to science and math teachers about the opportunities in summer institutes and full-time fellowships. Many teachers awarded grants.

(k) Arrange for substitutes for teachers who wish to attend conventions and meetings.

(l) Provide speakers for school assemblies.

(m) Provide films, technical journals and other aids to the schools.

(n) Provide laboratory equipment from local industries on a gift or loan basis to the schools. Donald Raunick, IBM, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., in charge.

(o) Prepare and circulate a calendar of scientific events, under direction of Mr. Victor Salvatore, IBM, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

(p) Arrange for speakers at PTA meetings and service clubs.

(q) Maintain a speakers' bureau for classroom instruction, with nearly 50 lecture-demonstration subjects available, under direction of Dr. George B. Hatch.

(r) Maintain roster of volunteer scientists. Under direction of Richard Counihan, IBM, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

8. Effectiveness: Reports and discussions at meetings. Questionnaire sent out in June 1957. Results not yet available.

9. Future plans:

(a) To publish annual report in fall of 1957.

(b) To reorganize into smaller geographic units to save travel time.

(c) Will change procedure for selection of executive committee. Each member group to appoint two representatives to an advisory council board, which will select 11 member executive committee.

(d) Plan to expand aid to teachers in the elementary schools.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], whose reputation is well established throughout the country and throughout the world as being opposed to this legislation and legislation of any kindred type, that we may have slept too long already before consideration of this legislation.

The Senate did add a scholarship provision, or rather its bill had a scholarship provision in it. They cut the scholarships to \$250 each, whereas our amended bill had originally, until it was stricken out, 10,000 scholarships to be awarded on the basis of need up to \$1,000 each. When the Senate put 20,000 scholarships of \$250 each in, they added to the House bill \$5 million instead of \$50 million, as the gentleman said, unless I have misunderstood him. And that would add \$10 million the second year, the third year it would add \$15 million, and the fourth year it would add \$20 million. The addition would not be \$200 million, as I understand it, but instead much, much less than what the gentleman from New York has said. In other words, somewhere around \$50 million or \$60 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the House we cannot perfect this legislation unless we get it to conference. That is all that the rule before us today does. It provides an avenue to get to conference. We will appoint conferees to sit down with the Senate conferees and try to resolve the differences between the two bills. I do not know where the gentleman got the questions that he read to you, which may have been questions on some of these tests that he says he found somewhere. I do not know about that. It is true that this bill does have a provision whereby there would be granted to the States on a 50-50 matching basis moneys to be used to improve our counseling and guidance system and our identification of bright children, and for that matter the identification of the skills, abilities, and intelligence of any school child whatever they might be. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House knows that this type of test has been used by the United States Army, Navy, and the Air Force since World War I. I believe World War I was the first war in which we used this kind of test.

Then in 1941, when the Second World War broke out, we got into this testing business on a big scale. I would like to say as a member of the Army in World War II, I was not altogether satisfied with the manner in which the Army handled its testing program. But, I do think the testing in connection with all the other items of information available will help us to guide the Nation, the States, and the schools themselves in guiding the bright children into a desire to go to college and improve themselves so they can help to bring about a bigger, a finer, and a greater America. I think substantially this bill is a good bill.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, if the bill goes to conference, and I am satisfied that it will, it shall be my purpose, certainly, as one of the conferees, and I am sure I speak for all the others, to bring back the best bill that we possibly can.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a vital part of the President's program. The only way we can secure a satisfactory bill is to send it to conference where, I hope, the conferees will work out a measure that can become a law. I repeat, by all means, this bill should be sent to conference in order that we can have a bill that I believe the President can sign and which the majority of the people want.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the able gentleman from Utah who has had long experience in the field of education.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, so many of our young people are completely misplaced and frustrated because their parents force them and they themselves get into programs where they do not belong and for which they have no aptitude. As a result, about half of all our youth have to drop out of school by the end of the second year, at the end of the sophomore year, because of this lack of guidance. These tests which I am so surprised to hear being attacked in this way will be helpful in discovering a young person's manual skills and dexterities, and his vocational interests and aptitudes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

(Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and urge that it be sent to conference.

(Mr. BAKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Bertha Sheppard Adkins of Salisbury, Md., was sworn in today as Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. She was appointed by President Eisenhower July 21, 1958, to succeed John Alanson Perkins, resigned.

Secretary Arthur S. Flemming administered the oath of office in a ceremony at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Prior to accepting her new appointment, Miss Adkins resigned as assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Miss Adkins has gained broad experience in working with women leaders in national and local organizations.

For 8 years Miss Adkins was dean of women at Western Maryland College and for 4 years dean of residence at Bradford Junior College in Massachusetts.

An alumna of Salisbury, Md., high school and Baldwin School in Bryn Mawr, Pa., Miss Adkins holds a bachelor of arts degree from Wellesley College and a master of arts degree from Columbia University.

In June 1953, Miss Adkins was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree from Western Maryland College. In 1955, she was elected a trustee of American University in Washington, D. C.

Miss Adkins is a life member of Pi Lambda Theta, an honorary society for women in education. She belongs to the Maryland Federation of Women's Clubs and the American Association of University Women, and has served as a State board member of both organizations. She is also a member of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women.

Recently, President Eisenhower appointed Miss Adkins to the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission and the members elected her chairman of its executive committee.

A daughter of Frederic Paul and Edna May—Sheppard—Adkins, Miss Adkins was born in Salisbury, Md., August 24, 1906. She is a Methodist and belongs to the following clubs: Hamilton Street, Baltimore; Harbor, Easton Md.; and Sulgrave, Washington, D. C. Her residence is 321 Park Avenue, Salisbury, Md.

Bertha Adkins will be an indefatigable resourceful worker and a fine executive. I wish her Godspeed in her difficult position.

Mr. Speaker, I hope sincerely this educational bill will go to conference. I have just come from the swearing in ceremony of Miss Bertha Adkins as Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. She will bring very fine knowledge and great experience to that great Government Department and will be very helpful, I know, to all Members of Congress. She was the dean of a fine college in Maryland, has held many positions of trust and influence. She was head of the National Republican Women's Com-

mittee for years and was assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee. She was much beloved in that position and deserves much credit for her work for President Eisenhower.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed in part out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield if it is not taken out of my time. That 5 minutes is very short, you know.

Mr. GWINN. Referring to the question that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] referred to, they were put in the RECORD in the proceedings of the Senate on August 12, page 15923, and they came from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They were published by the Science and Research Department. Senator GOLDWATER placed it in the RECORD.

My statement of the \$50 million a year additional scholarship was in error. It is \$50 million all told and not \$50 million per year.

I thank you very much.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If those who raised cattle for market followed the same general policy that we followed here in Congress, they would never wean a calf until it was bigger than its mother. What little I know I learned out of books written by people who thought self-reliance was a good thing. Our forefathers were willing to work. They were independent. They did not want somebody doing something for them all the time, and especially they did not wish King George telling them how to live. They were thrifty and they got along pretty well and the country was all right until we came along. When we did we began to wet nurse everyone.

Now, of course, education is a wonderful and fine thing, but how long are we going down the road where part of us live on the rest of us? That is what we are doing day after day. We have created a situation where we will not do a single thing for ourselves if we can get somebody else to do it for us.

One of the boys asked me to have lunch with him. I said, "What are you going to have?" I wanted to know before we went. When we make an appropriation for some other country we are never sure they will take it as offered. That is the attitude. It is all wrong. If we would rely on ourselves and let other people do the same we might all be more content and happy.

Now, getting back to the permission to speak out of order. A gentleman yesterday on the ticker commented that only Jimmie Hoffa can continue to rejoice in his good luck. The gentleman was referring to the defeat of the Kennedy-Ives bill. So Jimmie Hoffa rejoices. But the thing he rejoices about is because some folks are so dumb they do not understand that he admits he is a crook. Others do not seem to have the ability

to jail him. Why does not the Government hire some competent attorneys, some competent investigators first, and then some competent attorneys, and send Jimmie to jail? They did not in Michigan, but up there the people had an excuse. Jimmie contributed toward the election of some judges. That might make a difference.

Here is something else that was on the ticker:

Honest union members and the general public can regard it as a tragedy that politics has prevented the recommendations of the McClellan committee from being carried out this year.

Who stalled the McClellan recommendations? Not Senator GOLDWATER. Not Senator KNOWLAND. Gentlemen who think they are politically smart did it. That labor vote—the approval of a Reuther loomed big.

The Senate sent us a good bill? A bill that would protect the union man? The average individual? The man who creates a job? Meets a payroll?

That is all arrant nonsense. Anyone who cares to take a look at the bill knows it. Of course there is politics in it. Over there the vote was 88 to 1, and they voted that way because they did not know what was in the bill themselves. Every single amendment that was offered that would hurt a union man, crook who bosses the union men, was voted down. They sent it over here and thought we were so gullible we would not know what was in it.

Sure, Federal aid to education. The head fellow Meany said the bill was all right. Reuther said it was all right. Do you want to vote for anything Reuther wants? You know what he is after. Dictatorship. He uses force to get his way. He is a goon-squad leader.

Listen to this. The gentleman commented:

Constructive labor-reform legislation will definitely be brought forward again next year.

If that be true it will have to come from someone other than candidates for a presidential nomination. Now, you send over a political document like K-I over here, and I doubt very much if it will get by the House. That bill was as bad for the employers as the Wagner Act.

You could almost hold in one hand the real bad men that have been exposed in the unions by the McClellan Committee, but if there is anyone that needs help it is the member of the union, and the reason is that he has not anything to say about the amount of assessments and dues which are levied; he just pays and he has not anything to say about it at all. I leave it to you to figure that out.

Here is one more item:

In the meantime those who defeated this bill will bear a heavy responsibility for the labor racketeering that will continue unchecked.

Do you get that? Those Congressmen who voted against this bill 198 are responsible for the labor racketeering that will continue. What rotten nonsense. If those who wrote the bill had given us a worthwhile piece of proposed legislation not 50 would have voted against it.

If that committee over there would pay as much attention to Walter Reuther who is just as big a crook as Jimmy Hoffa, and if the Department of Justice would follow through and folks would quit coddling the labor bosses, we might need more jails. That may seem in contradiction of what I said earlier, that the real crooks were few in number, but unfortunately these big bosses and big crooks have little crooks working for and with them.

I cannot understand it to save my life. We all know about Hoffa; apparently he is as smart as any of them. He has been at it for years. I cannot understand how he gets away with what he does except that the Government will not pay the price to hire enough competent attorneys.

It would be unfair, it would be unjust to charge the committee with covering up for Walter Reuther—and please remember, I do not make any such charge; all I say is that being in the same political bed with him that they did not pull back the blankets when they got up in the morning and let us take a real look at Reuther. That seems to be the situation. Sure, Reuther puts up the campaign money for some Democratic and Republican candidates, but that is no reason why the Congress should not write sound, effective legislation protecting all.

When a gentleman from other body undertakes to tell us that 198 Members of the House are backing up racketeering there is something wrong with his head and we certainly do need Federal aid to educate some over on that side. But, Mr. Speaker, permit me to call attention to another situation.

TIME TO TAKE A LOOK, EVEN THOUGH WE WILL NOT LISTEN OR STOP

Certainly, the unfortunate who, through no fault of their own, have trouble in making both ends meet, should and will be treated sympathetically. None will be permitted to continue in dire need.

Nevertheless, the results which must follow the enactment of Federal legislation and the appropriation of the taxpayers' dollars must also be considered.

The situation seems to simmer down to the proposition of how long and to what extent should some of us live on the rest of us.

A thought-provoking article is that in the Saturday Evening Post of August 23, which reads as follows:

FULL EMPLOYMENT BY LAW WOULD END ECONOMIC FREEDOM

A number of liberals, including some labor leaders, are critical of what they term the administration's failure to carry out a solemn obligation of the Government. According to their story, the United States in 1946 promised by law to maintain full employment of its citizens at all times.

This is a distortion of the record. The bill they refer to was originally framed in 1945 to head off a calamitous depression which never materialized.

The reasoning of economic experts, as the war drew to a close, was highly plausible. There were more than 12 million Americans in the armed services. Nine or ten million would be thrown back on the labor market within a year, and it was supposed that this

would mean a return to mass unemployment.

The Wagner-Murray bill for full employment, introduced in 1945, gave extraordinary powers and responsibilities to the Federal Government. Philip Murray, then head of the CIO, reflected the left-wing opinion behind the proposal when he said that the Government should take over and operate idle factories. The original text of the bill declared that it was the Government's duty to furnish employment to all who sought work, on the farm or in mines, mills, and manufacturing. Putting it into practice would have required close controls and the nationalization of key industries.

When the bill passed in February 1946, it was called the Employment Act. Congress had removed its radical clauses, in spite of President Truman's strong support for the first version. What the law now says, and all it says, is that the President shall have a Council of Economic Advisers to aid him by continuous study in the preparation of an economic report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session. In addition, the law establishes the congressional Joint Economic Committee, made up of seven members from each House, who are to make their own investigations and offer informed judgments on the President's economic proposals.

These are useful provisions, but they are very far from anything like a full employment act. What had happened between the spring of 1945 and the spring of 1946 to tone down even Mr. Truman's enthusiasm for a planned economy? Nothing, except that the dire predictions of mass unemployment failed to come true. Faced by the shortages created by the war—in housing, cars, raw materials and consumer goods—the Nation rolled up its sleeves and went to work.

It is sometimes tedious to recall facts, rather than nourish fancies, but too much is at stake in the preservation of the American system to encourage any delusion that the Government can guarantee full employment without paralyzing controls that would put an end to American economic freedom.

The basic difficulty in working out an equitable and painless solution to taking care of the unemployment problem is due to the fact that the fabulous Uncle Sam doesn't have any money of his own. Taxing all of us, or, when the situation boils down, some of us, to support the rest of us runs head on into the sad fact that many of us are quite willing to rest on our oars while others do the work which must be done if we're to live in comparative comfort. It would be very helpful indeed if Congress could enact legislation which would plant in each of us an irresistible desire to go along on his own so far as is possible.

Often think how enjoyable it might be if I could just sit in the rockingchair on the porch and watch the world go by. Then, when I try it, the spirit of my ancestors gets me up on my feet. If I can't find anything else to do, will dig a few worms and go fishing—and believe me, brother, that's not all fun either. Because sometimes it rains and the fish won't bite.

There's a moral in this somewhere, if you can find it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] to correct the RECORD.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the permanent RECORD be corrected to show that on August 15 I took part along with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] in objecting to the request made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] that the farm bill S. 4071 be sent to conference. I ask that that correction be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the permanent RECORD will be so corrected.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this legislation. For anybody who agrees with me, the vote on the resolution is "No"—it should be defeated. The bill will help only a limited number of pupils. It is very discriminatory. You do not know whether it is a loan; you do not know whether it is a grant; you do not know whether it is a scholarship program. It has not been thought out carefully. It will cost perhaps a couple billion dollars—two thousand million dollars.

Also I am opposed to the Federal Government in any way intervening in the educational system of this great country of ours.

If you want trouble in our Federal education system adopt the legislation to send the bill to conference. This is the opening wedge. That is all it is. You have not been hearing from the folks back home because they know little about this proposed scholarship and loan program. The pressure groups are behind this legislation in order to get their foot in the door of our educational system. Once they get their foot in the door this program which is estimated to cost a billion and a half dollars, will next year be up, I predict, to \$3 billion, and then up each succeeding year. They will build up a bureaucracy within the Federal Government to perpetuate this entry into our educational system, they will be telling the local authorities what to do, when to do it, and how to do it. You will have problems that you do not anticipate by this gesture to help a limited number of pupils receive scholarships and it is a limited number.

For example, let us suppose John Smith, in block 1, gets a grant; Joe Brown, in block 2, gets a grant; but the boy in the third block, all of them in the same class, gets nothing. The parents are going to come to us and say, "Why do John Smith and Joe Brown get scholarships, grants, or loans, but my boy cannot get anything?"

You are going to help 20,000 or 30,000 students, maybe, and you will have about 2 million applicants. What happens to the others? If it is going to cost a couple of billion dollars to help 20,000 or 30,000 students, what would it cost to take care of a couple of million who are just as much entitled to a scholarship, loan, or grant as any other student? It will run into an exorbitant sum of money.

So you had better think carefully. This resolution should be defeated. The committee at least should have brought out a bill that was well thought out, not

a hodge-podge of ideas but something constructive, so Congress could vote intelligently on it.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come for this Congress to take some cognizance of the deficiencies in our educational system and try to help in whatever way we think is right.

This bill, which is not perfect, should be acted on now. The recent events have shown us that we have not exerted the influence we should to keep our educational system abreast of other lines of endeavor in this space age. Some of the best young brains and minds in America are being wasted because of lack of interest of the general public, and oftentimes because of the lack of funds on the part of the student and his family.

The time is now—not the next Congress. That might be too late. Accordingly, I believe the resolution should be adopted forthwith to permit the conferees to meet and iron out the differences between the House and Senate measures.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, of course, I am for this resolution. I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that since Saturday morning telegrams, in numbers the like of which I have never received in the 16 years I have been in Congress, came into my office from all parts of Indiana, in favor of this scholarship legislation. There are about 250 telegrams and letters in my office denouncing the Jenner amendment excluding Indiana that was attached to this bill in the other body.

I have never observed an uprising of indignation like has taking place in the Hoosier State because Indiana was more or less declared out of the Union as far as this legislation is concerned. These telegrams came from groups of schoolteachers, from principals, from superintendents, from noonday clubs, from individuals extending all the way from the Ohio River to Lake Michigan; small towns and large towns; Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, Logansport, Gary, South Bend; all over the State. Indiana is indeed aroused owing to the fact that the other body saw fit to exclude that great Hoosier State from this necessary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spent most of the day answering telephone calls from newspapers, television and radio stations throughout Indiana asking what is going to happen to Indiana's participation in this legislation. I sent a page boy over to the office just a minute ago to get some of these telegrams and bring them over here to show the membership a testimonial of protest against the Jenner amendment coming from the grassroots of Indiana. I would like to have shown the Members of the House the bulk of telegrams I received and the letters that started coming to me since

last Friday morning. Out of two-hundred-and-sixty-odd which came in before I left the office, the only message that came in endorsing Indiana's exclusion was a letter signed by some person down in southern Indiana. I would like to print all these messages in the RECORD but, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print a sample of about one-tenth of these protests against excluding Indiana from this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that this resolution is passed.

MOROCCO, IND., August 16, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

In regard to science scholarship and equipment bill, Newton County Classroom Teachers Association urges that Indiana be restored on basis of other States.

LAWRENCE BANNON,
President, Newton County Classroom
Teachers Association.

TERRE HAUTE, IND., August 16, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The West Vigo School Improvement Council regrets Senator JENNER's action removing Indiana from participation in science scholarship and equipment bill. We represent several thousand citizens who urge you to work to reinstate Indiana and seek passage for the bill. We would greatly appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT HILL,
Council President.

PORTLAND, IND., August 16, 1958.

Representative ROY MADDEN of Indiana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge Indiana be restored on scholarship and equipment bill.

PORTLAND TEACHERS ASSOCIATION.

ROACHDALE, IND., August 16, 1958.

Representative ROY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Montgomery County Classroom Teachers of Indiana request your utmost cooperation in restoring Indiana on basis of other States in the science scholarship and equipment bill.

ROBERT L. GOODING,
President.

FRANKLIN, IND., August 16, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Franklin classroom teachers urgently request that Indiana be restored on basis of other States to science scholarship and equipment bill.

GLADYS PASEL,
President.

CAMPBELLSBURG, IND., August 16, 1958.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator JENNER's action childish. We want Federal aid for schools.

H. E. ROBERSON,
Superintendent, Campbellsburg Schools.

BOONVILLE, IND., August 16, 1958.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please restore Indiana in science scholarship bill equip with other States. Disregard JENNER.

CHARLES J. POSEY,
Warrick County School Superintendent.

LOGANSPORT, IND., August 16, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Eliminate JENNER's ridiculous amendment to education scholarship and equipment bill.

CHAS. SHARP,
Superintendent of Schools.

MONON, IND., August 16, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please return Indiana same basis your State education bill.

BAIRD F. COX,
President, Jasper County Teachers.

LEBANON, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge that Indiana be restored on basis of other States in science scholarship and equipment bill.

AL CRAWFORD,
President, Lebanon Classroom Teachers Association.

BOONVILLE, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

We urge you support necessary legislation to strike out Jenner amendment to science scholarship and equipment bill.

MRS. MILDRED MARTIN,
President, Ohio Township Classroom Teachers.

NEW CASTLE, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives, Capitol
Building, Washington, D. C.:

Please restore Indiana on basis of other States in the science scholarship and equipment bill.

T. D. EDINGTON,
Superintendent of Schools.

ANGOLA, IND., August 15, 1958.

RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Request Indiana not be excluded from school bill benefits.

CLAYTON ELLIOTT,
County Superintendent, Steuben County.

JEFFERSONVILLE CITY SCHOOLS,
Jeffersonville, Ind., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MADDEN: I would like to solicit your consideration of restoring Indiana to eligibility for participation in the Science Scholarship and Equipment Bill.

We in the grass roots know that the need exists and I assure you that the school officials do not concur with Senator JENNER's statement that Indiana will take care of the need.

Our Senator's attitude has certainly aroused a great deal of feeling in this area.

Respectfully,
H. F. SCHULTE,
Superintendent.

RICHMOND, IND., August 15, 1958.

REPRESENTATIVE RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives, Capitol Hill,
United States Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your support in restoring Indiana in participation of the science scholarship and equipment bill.

PAUL C. GARRISON,
Superintendent, School.

LINTON, IND., August 15, 1958.

Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Representative, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: We strongly urge that Indiana be restored on the basis of other States in the science scholarship and equipment bill.

J. EARL BALES,
Superintendent, Linton-Stockton
School Corp.

BLUFFTON, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
Conference Committee,
Capitol Hill, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our public schools of Indiana want to be restored to the benefits of the science scholarship and equipment bill contrary to the expression of Senator JENNER. Please.

EDWIN E. PRIBLE,
Superintendent, Bluffton Public Schools.

NAPPANEE, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Nappanee classroom teachers urge restoration of Indiana on basis of other States for science scholarship and equipment bill passed by Congress.

PAUL J. HARTLE,
President, Nappanee Classroom Teachers.

GREENFIELD, IND., August 15, 1958.

RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Jenner amendment to science scholarship and equipment bill must be defeated. Schools hard pressed for money. Assistance needed.

CHARLES S. WISEHART,
Superintendent, Greenfield School.

CLAYPOOL, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request Indiana be restored to scholarship and equipment bill on basis of other States.

Mrs. MARY REECE,
President, Warsaw Classroom Teachers
Association.

DECATUR, IND., August 15, 1958.

Congressman RAY MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge that you do everything in your power to get Indiana restored on science scholarship and equipment bill.

M. GRABILL,
GUY BROWN,
Superintendents, Adams County and
Decatur Schools.

MOUNT VERNON, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We will appreciate efforts to have Indiana included in science scholarship bill.

MOUNT VERNON CLASSROOM TEACHERS
ASSOCIATION.

NEW ALBANY, IND., August 15, 1958.

Congressman RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Are we taking the first step toward recession? Senator JENNER in proposing his amendment to science scholarship and equipment bill but think he has. Let's be realistic. We can ill afford to pay cost for other States and stand on principle to the exclusion of our own needs. His figures are misleading. If not too late let us get in line.

GLEN BARKES,
Superintendent of Schools.

SALEM, IND., August 15, 1958.

Hon. Representative RAY MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Please see that Indiana is included in education bill.

CHARLES W. FRANKLIN,
Superintendent, Salem Washington
Township Schools.

ROCHESTER, IND., August 15, 1958.

Congressman RAY MADDEN,
Capitol Building,
Representative Office,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Rochester teachers urge restoration of Indiana to aid-to-education bill.

WILLIAM SCHROER.

GOSHEN, IND., August 15, 1958.

Hon. RAY MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe Indiana should be restored to share in S. 4237.

CLAUDE C. GIBSON,
President, Elkhart County Classroom
Teachers Association.

WARSAW, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge Indiana be given similar consideration to other States in education bill.

CARL BURT,
Superintendent, Warsaw City Schools.

TERRE HAUTE, IND.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We regard it highly unfair that Indiana children be denied equal educational benefits.

WAYNE COLTHARP,
President, Vigo County Classroom
Teachers Association, Seelyville,
Ind.

RUSHVILLE, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge defeat of Jenner amendment to school aid bill.

C. M. DEMUNBRUN,
Superintendent, Rush County Schools.

ELWOOD, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please restore Indiana on the basis of other States to science scholarship and equipment bill. We regret the action taken by our Senator.

KEITH SCOTT,
Superintendent, Elwood Public Schools.

RUSHVILLE, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge Indiana be restored on basis of other States to science scholarship, equipment bill. Jenner amendment must be discarded.

BERNARD K. MCKENZIE,
Superintendent of Schools.

PERU, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Contrary to views of Senator JENNER, Peru City teachers urgently request that Indiana be restored on scholarship bill on basis of other States.

DONALDA TILLET,
President, Peru Teachers Association.

FORT WAYNE, IND., August 15, 1958.

The Honorable RAY MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please put Indiana on the basis of other States in the science scholarship and equipment bill we oppose JENNER's amendment.

GRACE PENNINGTON,
President, Ft. Wayne Teachers Association.

WAKA RUSA, IND., August 15, 1958.

Congressman RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please restore Indiana on same basis as other States in Elliott science and equipment bill.

GLADE E. ROHRER,
Chairman Legislative Commission, Indiana
State Teachers Association.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY J. MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Exclude Jenner amendment Elliott bill, Indiana needs better schools.

ILA HORN.

GARRETT, IND., August 15, 1958.

Hon. RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Garrett Classroom Teachers Association requests that Indiana be restored on basis of other States in Senate bill S. 4237.

ALICE HALL,
Legislative Chairman.

RICHMOND, IND., August 15, 1958.

Hon. RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please restore Indiana to National Defense Act on basis of other States.

RICHARD HORN, President,
Richmond Classroom Teachers Association.

JEFFERSONVILLE, IND., August 15, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge that you give serious consideration to restoring Indiana on the same basis as other States in the science scholarship and equipment bill passed by Congress last week.

VANCE B. COLLINS,
Superintendent of Schools,
Clarksville, Ind.

BOONVILLE, IND., August 16, 1958.

Representative RAY MADDEN,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR MR. MADDEN: We in Indiana are shocked and disgusted by Senator JENNER's action in removing our State from the benefits of the new science scholarship and equipment bill. I speak for our local group of 65 teachers when I urge you to do everything in your power to rectify this terrible injustice to Indiana's children.

Yours truly,
RUTH B. WILSON,
President, Boonville-Boon Township
Classroom Teachers.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., August 19, 1958.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House Rules Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

We deplore the delay in the enactment of the scholarship-science aid bill, please use your influence in securing action before adjournment.

Mrs. DON HERRIN,
First Vice President, Indiana Congress
of Parents and Teachers.
Mrs. GRAYDON HENMAN,
Chairman of Legislation.

ANDERSON, IND., August 18, 1958.
Representative RAY MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We hope you will help restore Indiana to the science scholarship and equipment bill.
ANDERSON FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
JOHN GARRIGUS, President.

VEEDERSBURG, IND., August 15, 1958.
Representative RAY MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request Indiana be restored to receive science scholarship aid.

P. H. SPENCER,
Superintendent,
Veedersburg Van Buren School Corp.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., August 15, 1958.
Representative RAY MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Since Indiana money will be used to support Federal scholarship program see that Indiana is included.

OTTO JANERT,
Janert Packing Co., Inc.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 259, nays 110, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—259

Addonizio	Canfield	Eberharter
Albert	Cannon	Edmondson
Allen, Calif.	Carnahan	Elliott
Andersen,	Carrigg	Everett
H. Carl	Cederberg	Evins
Anderson,	Celler	Faberstein
Mont.	Chamberlain	Fascell
Andrews	Chelf	Fenton
Anfuso	Chenoweth	Fino
Ashley	Chiperfield	Flood
Aspinall	Christopher	Fogarty
Avery	Clark	Forand
Ayres	Coad	Ford
Baker	Cooley	Fountain
Baldwin	Corbett	Frazier
Baring	Cretella	Frelinghuysen
Barrett	Cunningham,	Fulton
Bass, N. H.	Iowa	Garmatz
Bass, Tenn.	Curtin	George
Becker	Curtis, Mass.	Glenn
Beckworth	Curtis, Mo.	Granahan
Bennett, Fla.	Davis, Tenn.	Grant
Bennett, Mich.	Dawson, Ill.	Gray
Bentley	Dawson, Utah	Green, Oreg.
Blatnik	Delaney	Green, Pa.
Boland	Dellay	Gregory
Bolling	Dent	Griffin
Bonner	Denton	Griffiths
Bosch	Derounian	Gubser
Boyle	Diggs	Hagen
Breeding	Dingell	Harris
Brooks, Tex.	Dixon	Haskell
Broomfield	Dollinger	Hays, Ark.
Brown, Ga.	Donohue	Hays, Ohio
Brown, Mo.	Dooley	Healey
Broyhill	Dorn, N. Y.	Heseltan
Byrd	Durham	Holifield
Byrne, Pa.	Dwyer	Holland

Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Lafore
Lane
Lankford
Latham
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Loser
McDonough
McFall
McGovern
McIntosh
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Maillard
Martin
Matthews

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Ill.
Arends
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Bates
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Budge
Burleson
Bush
Byrne, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.
Church
Collier
Cramer
Cunningham,
Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Dennison
Devereux
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Fallon
Feighan
Fisher
Flynt
Forrester

May
Meador
Merrow
Metcalfe
Mills
Mitchell
Moore
Morano
Morgan
Morris
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Natcher
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patterson
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Poage
Polk
Porter
Price
Quile
Rabaut
Rains
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Roberts
Robison, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt

NAYS—110

Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gross
Gwinn
Haley
Harden
Hardy
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hoeven
Hoffman
Jackson
Jensen
Johansen
Kitchen
Kruger
Laird
Landrum
Lipscomb
McGregor
McMillan
Marshall
Michel
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mumma
Murray
Neal
Nicholson
Nimtz

NOT VOTING—60

Bailey
Barden
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Blitch
Boggs
Boykin
Brooks, La.
Brownson
Buckley
Burdick
Clevenger
Coffin
Colmer
Coudert
Dies
Doyle
Engle
Friedel
Gordon
Hale
Halleck
Harrison, Nebr.
Hébert
Hillings
James
Jenkins
Jones, Mo.
Kearney
Kilburn
LeCompte
McCarthy
McCormack
McCulloch
McIntire
Macdonald
Mason
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Montoya

Morrison
Passman
Powell
Preston
Prouty
Radwan

Shuford
Sieminski
Spence
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Vanik

Vursell
Wainwright
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Winstead
Young

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Beamer against.
Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Baumhart for, with Mr. Minshall against.
Mr. James for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
Mr. Vanik for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.
Mr. Wainwright for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Coffin for, with Mr. Clevenger against.
Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Radwan against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Burdick against.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Kearney against.
Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Winstead against.
Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Belcher.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Miller of California, with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Engle with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Young with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. SCUDDER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BARDEN, BAILEY, ELLIOTT, METCALF, GWINN, KEARNS, and HASKELL.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2888) to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of August 15, 1958.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, this conference report adopts the philosophy of the House bill. That philosophy was based upon a constant thread through all the hearings that if the employees,

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 22, 1958
For actions of August 21, 1958
85th-2d, No. 146

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	8,12,23	
Budget.....	17	
Contracts.....	22	
Cotton.....	33	
Drought relief.....	14	Forestry.....3,16,37
Economic situation.....	41	Insect control.....32
Education.....	7	Legislative program.....23
Expenditure.....	20	Library.....7
Farm income.....	41	Livestock disease.....4
Farm machinery.....	31	Loans.....14,17
Farm program.....	17,24	Meatpackers.....26
Flood control.....	36	Mineral payments...2,21,25
Food additives.....	34	Natural resources.....30
Food prices.....	27	Personnel.....6,15
Food stamps.....	35	Price supports.....41
Foreign aid.....	19,23	Public debt.....23
Foreign trade.....	1,33	Public Law 480.....1,23
		Reclamation.....10,42
		Research.....13,32
		Roads.....9
		Ryukyu Islands.....11
		Saline water.....13,28
		Scientific information...7
		Small business.....18,40
		Soil bank.....29
		Surplus commodities.....1
		Textiles.....5,33
		Water pollution.....43
		Water resources.....39
		Wheat.....38

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses cleared supplemental appropriation bill. Conferees agreed to file report on bill to extend Public Law 480. Sen. Williams criticized administration of drought relief loan programs. House rejected minerals stabilization payments bill. House received conference report on education bill.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Conferees agreed to file a report on S. 3420, to extend Public Law 480. The "Daily Digest" states that "conferees agreed to a 1½-year extension of this act." (p. D883) Agreed to a unanimous consent request by Rep. Albert to authorize the Agriculture Committee to file a report of the conferees on the bill by midnight Thurs., Aug. 21. (p. 17484)
2. MINERAL PAYMENTS. Rejected, 159 to 182, S. 4036, to provide production payments to certain mineral producers to stabilize the price of certain minerals. pp. 17454-72
3. FORESTRY. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 10614, to provide for the conveyance of certain Forest Service land to Sumter County, Fla. (H. Rept. 2685). This bill had been ordered reported by the Committee earlier. pp. 17510, D838
4. LIVESTOCK DISEASE. The Agriculture Committee agreed to accept Senate amendments to H. R. 12126, to extend to wild animals the same prohibition against entry into the U. S. as domestic animals from any country where rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists. p. D388

5. TEXTILES. Conferees agreed to file a report on H. R. 469, to provide protection against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products. p. D889
6. PERSONNEL. Received the conference report on S. 1411, to give agencies discretion in suspending or retaining on duty Federal employees prior to security hearings (H. Rept. 2687). (pp. 17484-85, 17510) The report explains the actions of the conferees as follows:

"The Senate bill proposed a change in the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1950, which now require that the officer or employee concerned must be suspended without pay before he may receive a hearing, by providing, in effect, that in cases arising under such Act the officer or employee need not necessarily be suspended without pay pending a hearing but may be retained, in the discretion of the department or agency head, in the same or another position pending a hearing of his case.

"The House amendment continued this provision of the Senate bill and, in addition, reenacted the existing provisions of the Act of August 26, 1950, so as to clarify its application to activities of the Federal Government and provide additional safeguards for the protection of officers and employees from arbitrary actions thereunder.

"The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment except for the following change:

"The conference substitute makes it clear that the provisions of the revised Act of August 26, 1950, as contained in the amendment made by the first section of the conference substitute will be effective with respect to any action or proceeding for suspension or termination of employment commenced prior to July 1, 1959, but that the provisions of section 4 of such act as contained in such amendment will not be effective with respect to any case in which any such termination or employment was effected prior to the date of enactment of the conference substitute. Section 2 of the conference substitute also provides that the Act of August 26, 1950, as in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment of the conference substitute, shall be held and considered to remain in effect with respect to proceedings for suspension or termination of employment commenced after June 30, 1959.

"Under section 2 of the conference substitute it is intended that a Government department or agency may reopen any case disposed of under existing law, regardless of the outcome of such case, or may institute new proceedings in any such case. Any such reopened or new proceedings would be governed by the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1950, as contained in the conference substitute. However, it is not intended that proceedings heretofore completed under existing law and resulting in the termination of employment of the employees involved may be reopened by such employees for the purpose of having their cases disposed of under the new provisions.

"This limitation on the effective period of this legislation is established with the understanding on the part of the committee of conference that this legislation as so limited will provide a statutory basis for the Government employee security programs pending the development of a permanent Government employee security program subsequent to the study and report of the Commission on Government Security (Sen. Doc. No. 64, 85th Cong., 1st sess.)."

7. EDUCATION. Received the conference report on H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill (H. Rept. 2688). (pp. 17500-510) The bill as reported from conference retains the Senate amendment providing for the establishment of a Science Information Council by the National Science Foundation to advise on matters relating to the indexing, abstracting, translating and other services leading to effective dissemination of scientific information, and providing that the Director of the Department of Agriculture Library be a member of the Council.

The bill also provides \$20 million for fiscal 1959 and each of the three succeeding fiscal years for area vocational education programs.

8. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed that the rules may be suspended Fri., Aug. 22, for consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill. p. 17483
9. ROADS. Rep. Fallon reviewed the highlights of the work of the Committee on Public Roads during this session of Congress. pp. 17493-96
10. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 12899, to authorize Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, Calif. (H. Rept. 2682). p. 17510
11. RYUKYU ISLANDS. Received from the Department of the Army a proposed bill "to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands"; to Armed Forces Committee. p. 17510

SENATE

2. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION. Both Houses received and agreed to the ^{second} conference report on H. R. 13450, supplemental appropriation bill for 1959 (H. Rept. 2686), and acted on amendments in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 17510, 17474-6, 17438-44
13. SALINE WATER. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on S. J. Res. 135, to authorize the Interior Department to construct and operate demonstration plants to produce water for consumptive uses from saline and brackish waters. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 17424-6, 17454.
14. DROUGHT RELIEF. Sen. Williams criticized the administration of the drought relief loan program, and commended the passage of S. 304, to require State contribution of 25% toward any such programs, which he contended should reduce program abuses. He also inserted reports, prepared by FHA, on livestock loans made in Tex. and Okla. for more than \$50,000. pp. 17377-9
5. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7710, to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and accrued annual leave of deceased employees. p. 17445
16. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12281, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands to provide for an administrative site in the El Portal area of the Yosemite National Park, including the exchange of National Forest Land (S. Rept. 2491). p. 17374
17. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Symington inserted a speech he prepared to deliver to the Consolidated Rural Electric Cooperative, Mexico, Mo., criticizing the Administration farm policies, increased USDA budget, and REA loan review procedures. pp. 17381-3
18. SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Fulbright inserted a statement on the effect of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. p. 17418
19. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Williams inserted an article, "Living It Up In Laos," criticizing our foreign aid program. pp. 17419-20

20. EXPENDITURES. Sen. Bridges submitted an amendment to be proposed to H. R. 13192, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1959, to request the President to reduce the 1959 defense budget at least 2%, and reduce other Federal appropriations 4 to 10%, except for certain fixed cost items such as pensions, interest, and cooperative Federal-State programs. p. 17448
21. MINERALS. Sen. Bible expressed his disappointment over the action of the House in defeating the minerals stabilization bill. p. 17447
22. CONTRACTS. H. R. 11749, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, was made the unfinished business. p. 17446
23. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced the mutual security appropriation bill, the public debt limit extension bill, and the bill to extend Public Law 480, will be considered today, August 22. p. 17446

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

24. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Martin inserted his statement entitled, "The Progress of American Agriculture Under the Eisenhower Administration." pp. A7501-4
Rep. Cooley inserted a statement he prepared outlining the provisions of the new farm bill, and also a summary of the principal provisions of the bill prepared by the Office of the General Counsel, this Department. pp. A7505-6
Sen. Watkins inserted an article, "Denson Success Story--Talk of Vice Presidential Post in 1960 Expected." pp. A7528-9
Extension of remarks of Rep. Vursell reporting to the farmers in his district as to the activities of the Congress of interest to them. pp. A7562-3
Rep. Coad inserted a letter to the editor, "Production Balance for Farm Ills," and stated that "it is a very clear and understandable statement of what we must expect under the recently passed farm bill." p. A7580
Rep. Hoblitzell commended and inserted an article "which points out the change in political fashion of farm legislation." p. A7591
25. MINERALS. Rep. Metcalf inserted 2 telegrams in support of S. 4036, the proposed minerals stabilization bill. pp. A7506-7, A7535
Speech in the House of Rep. Boggs in support of this proposed legislation p. A7606
26. MEATPACKERS. Rep. Dixon stated that S. 1356, to transfer certain functions under the Packers and Stockyards Act, is superior to H. R. 9020 and should be adopted in conference, and inserted an article on this subject. p. A7508
27. FOOD PRICES. Rep. Hagen inserted an article discussing the spread between the prices paid to farmers for farm products and those paid by the housewife in the market place. p. A7512
28. SALINE WATER. Sen. Yarborough inserted a Brownsville, Tex. resolution urging that one of the saline water research program plants be located at Brownsville. p. A7516
29. SOIL BANK. Sen. Sparkman inserted two editorials stating that the soil bank was not a long-range solution nor permanent program to deal with farm problems. p. A7590
30. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Neuberger inserted an article discussing the problem of forest and rangeland fires in Alaska. pp. A7595-7

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

AUGUST 21, 1958.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BARDEN, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 13247]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *That this Act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the "National Defense Education Act of 1958".*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 101. Findings and declaration of policy.*
- Sec. 102. Federal control of education prohibited.*
- Sec. 103. Definitions.*

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

- Sec. 201. Appropriations authorized.*
- Sec. 202. Allotments to States.*
- Sec. 203. Payment of Federal capital contributions.*
- Sec. 204. Conditions of agreements.*
- Sec. 205. Terms of loans.*
- Sec. 206. Distributions of assets from student loan funds.*
- Sec. 207. Loans to institutions.*
- Sec. 208. Payments to cover reductions in amounts of loans.*
- Sec. 209. Administrative provisions.*

*TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE,
MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION*

- Sec. 301. Appropriations authorized.*
Sec. 302. Allotments to States.
Sec. 303. State plans.
Sec. 304. Payments to States.
Sec. 305. Loans to nonprofit private schools.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

- Sec. 401. Appropriations authorized.*
Sec. 402. Number of fellowships.
Sec. 403. Award of fellowships and approval of institutions.
Sec. 404. Fellowship stipends.
Sec. 405. Fellowship conditions.

*TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND
ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS*

PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

- Sec. 501. Appropriations authorized.*
Sec. 502. Allotments to States.
Sec. 503. State plans.
Sec. 504. Payments to States.

PART B—COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE TRAINING INSTITUTES

- Sec. 511. Authorization.*

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

PART A—CENTERS AND RESEARCH AND STUDIES

- Sec. 601. Language and area centers.*
Sec. 602. Research and studies.
Sec. 603. Appropriations authorized.

PART B—LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

- Sec. 611. Authorization.*

*TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZA-
TION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR
EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES*

PART A—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

- Sec. 701. Functions of the Commissioner.*
Sec. 702. Grants-in-aid; contracts.

PART B—DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON NEW EDUCATIONAL MEDIA

- Sec. 731. Functions of the Commissioner.*

PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 761. Establishment of the advisory committee.*
Sec. 762. Special personnel.
Sec. 763. Appropriations authorized.

TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

- Sec. 801. Statement of findings and purpose.*
Sec. 802. Amendment to Vocational Education Act of 1946.

TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

- Sec. 901. Functions of the service.*
Sec. 902. Science information council.
Sec. 903. Authority for certain grants and contracts.
Sec. 904. Appropriations authorized.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Sec. 1001. Administration.*
Sec. 1002. Advisory committees.
Sec. 1003. Exemption from conflict-of-interest laws of members of advisory committees or information council.
Sec. 1004. Administration of State plans.
Sec. 1005. Judicial review.
Sec. 1006. Method of payment.
Sec. 1007. Administrative appropriations authorized.
Sec. 1008. Allotments to Territories and possessions.
Sec. 1009. Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles. It depends as well upon the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge.

We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology.

The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense.

To meet the present educational emergency requires additional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

SEC. 102. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 103. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, except that as used in section 302 and 502, such term does not include

Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II, such term includes any private business school or technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(c) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(e) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the governor or by State law.

(f) The term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive, and such school-age population for the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the population between such ages for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

(g) The term "elementary school" means a school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

(h) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12. For the purposes of sections 301 through 304, the term "secondary school" may include a public junior college, as determined under State law.

(i) The term "public" as applied to any school or institution does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

(j) The term "nonprofit", as applied to a school or institution, means a school or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and, for purposes of part A, of title V, includes a school of any agency of the United States.

(k) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 201. *For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in such institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$47,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, \$82,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, \$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or complete their education. Sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agreements between the Commissioner and institutions of higher education, for payment of Federal capital contributions which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan funds.*

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 202. (a) *From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1962, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all of the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.*

(b) *Sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year ending after June 30, 1962, shall be allotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purpose for which such amounts are appropriated.*

PAYMENT OF FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 203. (a) *The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which institutions of higher education in a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions from the allotment of such State. In the event the total requested in such applications, which are made by institutions with which he has agreements under this title and which meet the requirements established in regulations of the Commissioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to the total requested in all such applications. In the event the total requested in such applications which are made by institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the*

Commissioner may reallocate the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under section 202 for such year. The Federal capital contribution to an institution shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan fund established under its agreement under this title.

(b) In no case may the total of such Federal capital contributions to any institution of higher education for any fiscal year exceed \$250,000.

CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENTS

SEC. 204. An agreement with any institution of higher education for Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner under this title shall—

(1) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by such institution;

(2) provide for deposit in such fund of (A) the Federal capital contributions, (B) an amount, equal to not less than one-ninth of such Federal capital contributions, contributed by such institution, (C) collections of principal and interest on student loans made from such fund, and (D) any other earnings of the fund;

(3) provide that such student loan fund shall be used only for loans to students in accordance with such agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this title, and for costs of litigation arising in connection with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest on such loan;

(4) provide that in the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund special consideration shall be given to (A) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (B) students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language and

(5) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this title and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the institution.

TERMS OF LOANS

SEC. 205. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year to any student made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed \$1,000, and the total for all years to any student from such funds may not exceed \$5,000.

(b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by any institution of higher education shall be made on such terms and conditions as the institution may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the institution) with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of study; and except that—

(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of

maintaining good standing in such course of study, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate or graduate student;

(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount, together with interest thereon, in equal annual installments, or, if the borrower so requests, in graduated periodic installments (determined in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner), over a period beginning one year after the date on which the borrower ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education and ending eleven years after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on any such loan, and periodic installments need not be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education, or (ii) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, (B) any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period during which the repayment must be completed, (C) such ten-year period may also be extended for good cause determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and (D) the borrower may at his option accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan;

(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school in a State, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each complete academic year of such service;

(4) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum except that no interest shall accrue before the date on which repayment of the loan is to begin;

(5) such a loan shall be made without security and without endorsement, except that, if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required;

(6) the liability to repay any such loan shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

(7) such a loan by an institution for any year shall be made in such installments as may be provided in regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with the institution under this title and, upon notice to the Commissioner by the institution that any recipient of a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld, as may be appropriate; and

(8) no note or other evidence of such a loan may be transferred or assigned by the institution of higher education making the loan except, upon the transfer of the borrower to another institution of higher education participating in the program under this title (or, if not participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by the Commissioner for such purpose), to such institution.

(c) *An agreement under this title for payment of Federal capital contributions shall include provisions designed to make loans from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement reasonably available (to the extent of the available funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such institution in need thereof.*

DISTRIBUTIONS OF ASSETS FROM STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

SEC. 206. (a) After June 30, 1966, and not later than September 30, 1966, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the student loan fund established under this title by each institution of higher education as follows:

(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1966, as the total amount of the Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Commissioner under this title bears to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the institution's capital contributions to such fund.

(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the institution.

(b) After September 30, 1966, each institution with which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this title shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the institution after June 30, 1966, in payment of principal or interest on student loans made from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of litigation incurred in collection of the principal or interest on loans from the fund and not already reimbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of principal or interest) as was determined for the Commissioner under subsection (a).

(c) Upon a finding by the institution or the Commissioner prior to July 1, 1966, that the liquid assets of a student loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this title exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the foreseeable future, and upon notice to such institution or to the Commissioner, as the case may be, there shall be, subject to such limitations as may be included in regulations of the Commissioner or in such agreement, a capital distribution from such fund. Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed as the Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner to the student loan fund prior to such distribution bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the capital contributions to the fund made by the institution.

(2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall be paid to the institution.

LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 207. (a) Upon application by any institution of higher education with which he has made an agreement under this title, the Commissioner may make a loan to such institution for the purpose of helping to finance the institution's capital contributions to a student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Any such loan may be made only if such institution shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this title. Loans

made to institutions under this section shall bear interest at a rate which the Commissioner determines to be adequate to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this section, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, but not to exceed a total of \$25,000,000.

(c) Loans made by the Commissioner under this section shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Commissioner to be appropriate in each case, but not exceeding fifteen years.

PAYMENTS TO COVER REDUCTIONS IN AMOUNTS OF LOANS

SEC. 208. In addition to the payments otherwise authorized to be made pursuant to this title, the Commissioner shall pay to the appropriate institution, at such time or times as he determines, an amount which bears the same ratio to the interest which has been prevented from accruing and the portion of the principal which has been cancelled on student loans pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 205 (b) (and not previously paid pursuant to this subsection) as the total amount of the institution's capital contributions to such fund under this title bears to the sum of such institution's capital contributions and the Federal capital contributions to such fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 209. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the other powers conferred upon him by this title, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this title and to compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title.

(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for (1) making payments to State educational agencies under this title for the acquisition of equipment (suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language) and for minor remodeling described in paragraph (1) of section 303 (a), and (2) making loans authorized in section 305. There are also authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agencies under this title to carry out the programs described in paragraph (5) of section 303 (a).

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 302. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 301 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008, and shall reserve 12 per centum for loans authorized in section 305. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

(A) the school-age population of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)),

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(2) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the continental United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum or more than $66\frac{2}{3}$ per centum. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1959, on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1960, and the second shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1962.

(3) For the purposes of this title—

(A) The term "child of school age" means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

(B) The term "continental United States" does not include Alaska.

(C) The term "income per child of school age" for any State or for the continental United States means the total personal income for the State and the continental United States, respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in such State and in the continental United States, respectively.

(4) A State's allotment under this subsection shall remain available for payment pursuant to section 304 (a) for projects in such State until the end of the fiscal year following the year for which the allotment is made.

(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the second sentence of section 301 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000,

the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 303. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and—

(1) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 302 (a) will be expended solely for projects approved by the State educational agency for (A) acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audio-visual materials and equipment and printed materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language, in public elementary or secondary schools, or both, and (B) minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such materials or equipment;

(2) sets forth principles for determining the priority of such projects in the State for assistance under this title and provides for undertaking such projects, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

(3) provides an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency to any applicant for a project under this title;

(4) provides for the establishment of standards on a State level for laboratory and other special equipment acquired with assistance furnished under this title;

(5) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 302 (b) will be expended solely for (A) expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in public elementary and secondary schools in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and (B) administration of the State plan.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 304. (a) From a State's allotment for a fiscal year under section 302 (a), the Commissioner shall, from time to time during the period such allotment is available for payment as provided in paragraph (4) of section 302 (a), pay to such State an amount equal to one-half of the expenditures for projects for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling referred to in paragraph (1) of section 303 (a) which are carried out under its State plan approved under section 303 (b); except that no State shall receive payments under this subsection for any period in excess of its allotments for such period under section 302 (a).

(b) From a State's allotment under section 302 (b) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner shall from time to time pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended by such State for such year to carry out the program referred to in paragraph (5) of section

303 (a) under its State plan approved under section 303 (b). From a State's allotment under section 302 (b) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal one-half of the amount so expended under its State plan approved under section 303 (b); except that no State shall receive payments under this subsection for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under section 302 (b) for that fiscal year.

LOANS TO NONPROFIT PRIVATE SCHOOLS

SEC. 305. (a) The Commissioner shall allot, out of funds reserved for each fiscal year for the purposes of this section under the provisions of section 302 (a), to each State for loans under the provisions of this section an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as the number of persons in such State enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools bears to the total of such numbers for all States.

(b) From the sums allotted to each State under the provisions of this section the Commissioner is authorized to make loans to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in such State for the purposes for which payments to State educational agencies are authorized under the first sentence of section 301. Any such loan—

(1) shall be made upon application containing such information as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioner;

(2) shall be subject to such conditions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

(3) shall bear interest at the rate arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the date the application for the loan is approved and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum; and

(4) shall mature and be repayable on such date as may be agreed to by the Commissioner and the borrower, but such date shall not be more than ten years after the date on which such loan was made.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 402. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner is authorized to award one thousand fellowships under the provisions of this title, and during each of the three succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award one thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellowships shall be for periods of study not in excess of three academic years.

AWARD OF FELLOWSHIPS AND APPROVAL OF INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioner shall award fellowships under this title to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by

him under this section. The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding:

(1) that such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded,

(2) that such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation, and

(3) that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs preference will be given to persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education.

(b) The total of the fellowships awarded under this title for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program at any institution of higher education may not exceed a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the objective referred to in subsection (a) (2).

FELLOWSHIP STIPENDS

SEC. 404. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of \$2,000 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate degree, \$2,200 for the second such year, and \$2,400 for the third such year, plus an additional amount of \$400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study such amount, not more than \$2,500 per academic year, as is determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the new graduate program or of the expansion in an existing graduate program in which such person is pursuing his course of study, which is reasonably attributable to him.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 405. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 404 only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities, approved by the Commissioner.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 501. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making grants to State educational agencies under this part to assist them to establish and maintain programs of testing and guidance and counseling.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 502. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total of increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 503. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and sets forth—

(1) a program for testing students in the public secondary schools, and if authorized by law in other secondary schools, of such State to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and

(2) a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools of such State (A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (B) to encourage students with outstanding aptitude and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 504. (a) Payment under this part shall be made to those State educational agencies which administer plans approved under section 503. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, such payments shall equal the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal one-half of the amount so expended; except that no State educational agency shall receive payment under this part for any fiscal year in excess of that State's allotment for that fiscal year as determined under section 502.

(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 503 and in which the State educational agency is not authorized by law to make payments to cover the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools in such State to determine student abilities and aptitudes, the Commissioner shall arrange for the testing of such students and shall pay the cost thereof for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and one-half of the cost thereof for any of the three succeeding fiscal years out

of such State's allotment. Testing of students pursuant to this subsection shall, so far as practicable, be comparable to, and be done at the same grade levels and under the same conditions as in the case of, testing of students in public schools under the State plan.

PART B—COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE TRAINING INSTITUTES

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 511. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$6,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and \$7,250,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, by contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for the provision of training to improve the qualifications of personnel engaged in counseling and guidance of students in secondary schools, or teachers in such schools preparing to engage in such counseling and guidance. Each individual, engaged, or preparing to engage, in counseling and guidance in a public secondary school, who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance.

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

PART A—CENTERS AND RESEARCH AND STUDIES

LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS

SEC. 601. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, of centers for the teaching of any modern foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner determines (1) that individuals trained in such language are needed by the Federal Government or by business, industry, or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States. Any such contract may provide for instruction not only in such modern foreign language but also in other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used, to the extent adequate instruction in such fields is not readily available, including fields such as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology. Any such contract may cover not more than 50 per centum of the cost of the establishment and operation of the center with respect to which it is made, including the cost of grants to the staff for travel in the foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject matter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working is concerned and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to such centers to teach or assist in teaching therein and the cost of their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(b) *The Commissioner is also authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals undergoing advanced training in any modern foreign language (with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a)), and other fields needed for a full understanding of the area, region, or country in which such language is commonly used, at any short-term or regular session of any institution of higher education, including allowances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of residence, but only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients of such stipends will, on completion of their training, be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an institution of higher education or for such other service of a public nature as may be permitted in regulations of the Commissioner.*

RESEARCH AND STUDIES

SEC. 602. The Commissioner is authorized, directly or by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages and other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in such training, or in training teachers of such languages or in such fields.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 603. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part, not to exceed \$8,000,000 in any one fiscal year.

PART B—LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 611. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$7,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign language in elementary or secondary schools. Each individual (engaged, or preparing to engage, in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign language in a public elementary or secondary school) who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance.

**TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN
MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION,
RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA
FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES**

PART A—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSIONER

SEC. 701. In carrying out the provisions of this part the Commissioner, in cooperation with the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media (established by section 761), shall (through grants or contracts) conduct, assist, and foster research and experimentation in the development and evaluation of projects involving television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication which may prove of value to State or local educational agencies in the operation of their public elementary or secondary schools, and to institutions of higher education, including the development of new and more effective techniques and methods—

(1) for utilizing and adapting motion pictures, video tapes and other audio-visual aids, film strips, slides and other visual aids, recordings (including magnetic tapes) and other auditory aids, and radio or television program scripts for such purposes;

(2) for training teachers to utilize such media with maximum effectiveness; and

(3) for presenting academic subject matter through such media.

GRANTS-IN-AID; CONTRACTS

SEC. 702. In carrying out the provisions of section 701, the Commissioner—

(1) may make grants-in-aid, approved by the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and individuals for projects of research or experimentation referred to in section 701;

(2) may enter into contracts, approved by the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, with public or private agencies, organizations, groups, and individuals for projects of research or experimentation referred to in section 701; and

(3) shall promote the coordination of programs conducted or financed by him under this title with similar programs conducted by other agencies, institutions, foundations, organizations, or individuals.

**PART B—DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON NEW EDUCATIONAL
MEDIA**

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSIONER

SEC. 731. In order to disseminate information concerning new educational media (including the results of research and experimentation conducted under part A of this title) to State or local educational agencies, for use in their public elementary or secondary schools, and to institutions of higher education, the Commissioner—

(1) shall make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication by State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education for educational purposes;

(2) shall prepare and publish catalogs, reviews, bibliographies, abstracts, analyses of research and experimentation, and such other materials as are generally useful in the encouragement and more effective use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication for educational purposes;

(3) may, upon request, provide advice, counsel, technical assistance, and demonstrations to State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize such media of communication to increase the quality or depth or broaden the scope of their educational programs;

(4) shall prepare and publish an annual report setting forth (A) projects carried out under this title and the cost of each such project, and (B) developments in the utilization and adaptation of media of communication for educational purposes; and

(5) may enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals to carry out the provisions of this part.

PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 761. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on New Educational Media (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Advisory Committee"). The Advisory Committee shall consist of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, a representative of the National Science Foundation and twelve persons appointed, without regard to the civil-service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Three of such appointed members shall be individuals identified with the sciences, liberal arts, or modern foreign languages in institutions of higher education; three shall be individuals actually engaged in teaching or in the supervision of teaching in elementary or secondary schools; three shall be individuals of demonstrated ability in the utilization or adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication for educational purposes; and three shall be individuals representative of the lay public who have demonstrated an interest in the problems of communication media.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall—

(1) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Commissioner on matters relating to the utilization or adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, or related media of communication for educational purposes, and on matters of basic policy arising in the administration of this title;

(2) review all applications for grants-in-aid under part A of this title for projects of research or experimentation and certify approval to the Commissioner of any such projects which it believes are appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title; and

(3) review all proposals by the Commissioner to enter into contracts under this title and certify approval to the Commissioner of

any such contracts which it believes are appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

(c) The Commissioner may utilize the services of any member or members of the Advisory Committee in connection with matters relating to the provisions of this title, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

(d) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on business of the Advisory Committee or at the request of the Commissioner under subsection (c) of this section, receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, not to exceed \$50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

SPECIAL PERSONNEL

SEC. 762. The Commissioner may secure from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, without regard to the civil-service laws, the assistance and advice of persons in the United States and from abroad who are experts in the utilization and adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, and other related media of communication for educational purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 763. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the sum of \$5,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of this title.

TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 801. The Congress hereby finds that the excellent programs of vocational education, which States have established and are carrying on with the assistance provided by the Federal Government under the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (the George-Barden Act), need extension to provide vocational education to residents of areas inadequately served and also to meet national defense requirements for personnel equipped to render skilled assistance in fields particularly affected by scientific and technological developments. It is therefore the purpose of this title to provide assistance to the States so that they may improve their vocational education programs through area vocational education programs approved by State boards of vocational education as providing vocational and related technical training and retraining for youths, adults, and older persons, including related instruction for apprentices, designed to fit them for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in scientific or technical fields.

AMENDMENT TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946

SEC. 802. The Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15i-15m, 15o-15q, 15aa-15jj) is amended by adding after title II the following new title:

“TITLE III—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

“AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

“SEC. 301. *There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years the sum of \$15,000,000 for area vocational education programs, to be apportioned for expenditure in the States as provided in section 302.*

“ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

“SEC. 302. (a) *From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 301, each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the total of the amounts apportioned under title I of this Act, the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31–33), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U. S. C. 34), to such State for such year bears to the total of the amounts so apportioned to all the States for such year.*

“(b) *The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State certifies to the Commissioner will not be required for carrying out area vocational education programs (under the part of the State plan meeting the requirements of section 305) shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year. Any amount so reallocated to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a).*

“PAYMENTS TO STATES

“SEC. 303. (a) *Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 302 for any fiscal year shall be paid on condition:*

“(1) *that there shall be spent for such year an equal amount in State or local funds, or both, for area vocational education programs operated under the provisions of this title;*

“(2) *that funds appropriated under this title will not be used to reduce the amount of State or local funds, or both, being spent for vocational education programs operated under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I and II of this Act and reported to the Commissioner, but such State or local funds, or both, in excess of the amount necessary for dollar for dollar matching of funds allotted to a State under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I and II of this Act may be used to match funds appropriated under this title;*

“(3) *that funds appropriated under section 301 of this title shall be used exclusively for the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge, as determined by the State board for such State, in fields necessary for the national defense.*

“(b) *The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State for area vocational education programs under this title for such period; and shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, reduced or increased,*

as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this subsection) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for any prior period for such purpose under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under this title for such purpose. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine.

"USE OF FUNDS

"SEC. 304. (a) Funds paid to a State under this title for area vocational education programs may be used, in carrying out such programs (under the part of the State plan meeting the requirements of section 305), for—

"(1) maintenance of adequate programs of administration, supervision, and teacher-training;

"(2) salaries and necessary travel expenses of State or local school personnel, including teachers, coordinators, supervisors, vocational guidance counselors, teacher-trainers, directors, administrators, and others;

"(3) travel expenses of members of advisory committees or State boards;

"(4) purchase, rental, or other acquisition, and maintenance and repair, of instructional equipment;

"(5) purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids;

"(6) necessary costs of transportation of students;

"(7) securing necessary educational information and data as a basis for the proper development of area vocational education programs and programs of vocational guidance;

"(8) training and work-experience training programs for out-of-school youths;

"(9) related instruction for apprentices; and

"(10) determining the need for, and planning and developing, area vocational education programs.

"(b) Any equipment and teaching aids purchased with funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title shall become the property of the State.

"ADDITIONAL STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 305. (a) To be eligible to participate in this title the State plan must be amended to include a new part which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of such part of the plan (or for the supervision of the administration thereof by State or local educational agencies);

"(2) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors and others having responsibilities under the plan;

"(3) shows the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out such part of the State plan;

"(4) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of such part of the State plan; and

"(5) provides that the State board will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this title.

“(b) The Commissioner shall approve a part of any plan for purposes of this title if he finds that it fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

“(c) Whenever the Commissioner after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board finds that—

“(1) the part of the State plan approved under subsection (b) has been so changed that it no longer complies with any provision required by subsection (a) of this section to be included in such part, or

“(2) in the administration of such part of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State from its allotments under section 302 (or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for projects under or portions of such part of the State plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State from its allotments under section 302 (or shall limit payments to projects under or portions of such part of the State plan in which there is no such failure).

“(d) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action under subsection (c) of this section, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

“(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

“(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

“APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION

“SEC. 306. There are hereby authorized to be included for each fiscal year in the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as are necessary to administer the provisions of this title.

“DEFINITIONS

“SEC. 307. For purposes of this title—

“(a) The term ‘State’ includes Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and Guam.

“(b) The term ‘Commissioner’ means the Commissioner of Education.

“(c) The terms ‘State plan’ and ‘State board’ shall have the meaning which said terms have in the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114).

“(d) The term ‘area vocational education program’ means a program consisting of one or more less-than-college-grade courses conducted under public supervision and control and on an organized, systematic class basis, which is designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in recognized occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge, and which is made available to residents of the State or an area thereof designated and approved by the State board, who either have completed junior high school or, regardless of their school credits, are at least sixteen years of age and can reasonably be expected to profit by the instruction offered.”

TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

FUNCTIONS OF THE SERVICE

SEC. 901. The National Science Foundation shall establish a Science Information Service. The Foundation, through such Service, shall (1) provide, or arrange for the provision of, indexing, abstracting, translating, and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information, and (2) undertake programs to develop new or improved methods, including mechanized systems, for making scientific information available.

SCIENCE INFORMATION COUNCIL

SEC. 902. (a) The National Science Foundation shall establish, in the Foundation, a Science Information Council (hereafter in this title referred to as the “Council”) consisting of the Librarian of Congress, the director of the National Library of Medicine, the director of the Department of Agriculture library, and the head of the Science Information Service, each of whom shall be ex officio members, and fifteen members appointed by the Director of the National Science Foundation. The Council shall annually elect one of the appointed members to serve as chairman until the next election. Six of the appointed members shall be leaders in the fields of fundamental science, six shall be leaders in the fields of librarianship and scientific documentation, and three shall be outstanding representatives of the lay public who have demonstrated interest in the problems of communication. Each appointed member of such Council shall hold office for a term of four years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term, and (2) of the members first appointed, four shall hold office for a term of three years, four shall hold office for a term of two years, and three shall hold office for a term of one year, as designated by the Director of the National Science Foundation at the time of appointment. No appointed member of the Council shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Council to advise, to consult with, and to make recommendations to, the head of the Science Information Service. The Council shall meet at least twice each year, and at such other times as the majority thereof deems appropriate.

(c) Persons appointed to the Council shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at rates fixed by the National Science Foundation, but not to exceed \$50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

SEC. 903. *In carrying out its functions under this title, the National Science Foundation shall have the same power and authority it has under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to carry out its functions under that Act.*

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 904. *There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.*

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 1001. (a) *The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.*

(b) *In administering the titles of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U. S. C., sec. 5), of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.*

(c) *The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the activities of the Office of Education under this Act, including recommendations for needed revisions in the provisions thereof.*

(d) *The Secretary shall advise and consult with the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs with a view to securing full information concerning all specialized scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs administered by or under any such department or agency and to developing policies and procedures which will strengthen the educational programs and objectives of the institutions of higher education utilized for such purposes by any such department or agency.*

(e) *Any agency of the Federal Government shall exercise its functions under any other law in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding or limiting the authority of any such agency under any other law.*

(f) *No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.*

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 1002. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may appoint an advisory committee, or advisory committees, to advise and consult with him with respect to the administration of the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible. Any such committee shall have twelve members as follows:

(1) Four members who are recognized scholars in any of the following fields: engineering, mathematics, or science;

(2) Four members who are recognized scholars in any of the fields of the humanities; and

(3) Four members from such fields of endeavor as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

Members of an advisory committee appointed under this section, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$50 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

EXEMPTION FROM CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST LAWS OF MEMBERS OF
ADVISORY COMMITTEES OR INFORMATION COUNCIL

SEC. 1003. (a) Any member of an advisory committee or information council appointed under this Act is hereby exempted with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The exemption granted by subsection (a) shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

(2) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 1004. (a) No State plan submitted under one of the titles of this Act shall be approved by the Commissioner which does not—

(1) provide, in the case of a plan submitted under title III or under title V, or section 1009 of this title, that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(2) provide that such commission or agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under such title or section; and

(3) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under such title or section.

(b) *The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof without first affording the agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.*

(c) *Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the agency administering a State plan approved under one of the titles of this Act, finds that—*

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this Act governing its original approval, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,
the Commissioner shall notify such State agency, in the case of a plan submitted under title III or V or section 1009 of this title, that no further payments will be made to the State under such title or section (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under such title or section, as the case may be (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 1005. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this Act, or with respect to his final action under section 1004 (c), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file in the United States district court for the district in which the capital of the State is located, a petition to review such action. The petition for review shall (1) contain a concise statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based and (2) designate that part of the Commissioner's decision sought to be reviewed.

(b) Notification of the filing of the petition for review shall be given by the clerk of the court by mailing a copy of the petition to the Commissioner.

(c) No costs or docket fees shall be charged or imposed with respect to any judicial review proceedings, or appeal therefrom, taken under this Act.

(d) Upon receipt of the petition for review the Commissioner shall, within twenty days thereafter, certify and file in the court the record on review, consisting of the complete transcript of the proceedings before the Commissioner. No party to such review shall be required, by rule of court or otherwise, to print the contents of such record filed in the court.

(e) The court after review may dismiss the petition or deny the relief prayed for, or may suspend, modify, or set aside, in whole or in part, the action of the Commissioner, or may compel action unlawfully withheld. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review as provided in section 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

METHOD OF PAYMENT

SEC. 1006. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other

organization, pursuant to a grant, loan, or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of grants or loans, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 1007. *There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act, including the administrative expenses of State commissions.*

ALLOTMENTS TO TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

SEC. 1008. *The amounts reserved by the Commissioner under sections 302 and 502 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs for the type of assistance furnished under the part or title in which the section appears.*

IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES OF STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

SEC. 1009. (a) *For the purpose of assisting the States to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of educational statistics provided by State and local reports and records and the methods and techniques for collecting and processing educational data and disseminating information about the condition and progress of education in the States there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for grants to States under this section, such sums as the Congress may determine.*

(b) *Grants under this section by the Commissioner shall be equal to one-half of the cost of State educational agency programs to carry out the purposes of this section, including (1) improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of statistical data supplied by local educational units, (2) the development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve as guides for local educational units, (3) the conduct of conferences and training for personnel of local educational units and of periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for records and reports, (4) improving methods for obtaining, from other State agencies within the State, educational data not collected by the State educational agency, or (5) expediting the processing and reporting of statistical data through installation and operation of mechanical equipment. The total of the payments to any State under this section for any fiscal year may not exceed \$50,000.*

(c) *Payments with respect to any program of a State educational agency under this section may be made (1) only to the extent it is a new program or an addition to or expansion of an existing program, and (2) only if the State plan approved under subsection (d) includes such program.*

(d) *The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for purposes of this section if such plan meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and*

sets forth the programs proposed to be carried out under the plan and the general policies to be followed in doing so.

And the Senate agree to the same.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
CARL ELLIOTT,
LEE METCALF,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
H. G. HASKELL, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
PAT McNAMARA,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The committee of conference agreed upon a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed upon in conference are noted in the following outline, except for minor, technical, and conforming changes.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The provisions of this title in the conference substitute are substantially the same as those in the House bill, except that changes have been made in the findings and declaration of policy to make it consistent with the agreement reached by the conferees.

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The provisions of the House bill enable the Commissioner to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study, and to make loans to institutions to enable them to establish the funds where necessary. The Senate provision for loans differed substantially. The conference substitute adopts the House bill, with several changes which are generally of minor importance. These changes are the following:

(1) The Senate amendment required no matching of Federal funds. The requirement in the House bill of 20 percent matching by colleges of Federal funds is reduced in the conference substitute to 10 percent matching.

(2) The House bill provided that interest on student loans would be at the rate of 2 percent per year while the student was in school and for 1 year thereafter. Thereafter the loan would bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per year. The Senate amendment, in its loan title, provided for interest at the rate of 2 percent per year, beginning 1 year after the student finished school. The conference substitute provides for interest at the rate of 3 percent per year, beginning 1 year after the borrower ceases to be a full-time student at an institution of higher education.

(3) The Senate amendment provided that the loan would be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school at the rate of 20 percent of the unpaid balance of the loan (plus interest thereon) for each academic year of such service. The conference substitute provides for the cancellation of one-half of the loan for teaching over a 5-year period in public elementary or secondary schools.

(4) Under the House bill, loans would be repaid in equal annual installments. The conference substitute adopts a provision of the Senate amendment making it explicit that repayments may be made in installments which are graduated.

(5) The conference substitute also adopts a provision, taken from the Senate amendment, suspending payments on principal, and interest accruals, while the borrower is in the Armed Forces (but not for more than 3 years).

(6) The House bill provided that loans shall be made without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. The conference substitute omits this provision.

(7) The conference substitute incorporates a provision of the Senate amendment that in making loans special consideration shall be given to persons whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign language, and primarily to persons with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

The House bill authorized the appropriation of \$60,000,000 for fiscal 1959 and each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years for making payments to State educational agencies for the acquisition of equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language and for minor remodeling of the laboratory or other space used for such material and equipment. The bill also authorized the appropriation of \$5,000,000 for making payments to the States for expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and the administration of the State plan.

The Senate amendment follows the House bill with two exceptions.

First, the authorization of appropriations in the Senate amendment for laboratory equipment and minor remodeling was \$70,000,000 per year.

Secondly, the Senate amendment provided that 12 percent of the sums appropriated for laboratory equipment and minor remodeling would be used for making loans to private nonprofit schools. The sums available for loans would be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative numbers of children enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in the respective States. The loans would be made for the same purposes that the grants could be made under the title. The loans would bear interest at one-quarter of 1 percent per year above the rate equal to the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States (adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent), and shall mature not later than 10 years after the loan is made.

The conference substitute is substantially the same as the Senate amendment.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for the award of 1,000 fellowships for fiscal 1959, and 1,500 such fellowships for each of the next 3 fiscal years, for periods of study not in excess of 3 academic years. The only difference between the two versions was a provision in the House bill that the fellowships be awarded without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

Part A—State Programs

Both versions provide substantially similar programs of Federal assistance in the establishment and maintenance of programs of testing and guidance and counseling. The Senate amendment differs from the House bill in providing that where a State participating in the program is not authorized to use State funds for testing students in private nonprofit secondary schools to determine aptitude and ability, the Commissioner may arrange for testing such students, and would pay the cost thereof for fiscal 1959, and one-half the cost thereof for any of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, out of the State's allotment. This testing program would be comparable to that carried out in the public schools. The conference substitute is substantially the same as the Senate bill.

Part B—Institutes in Guidance and Counseling

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for the establishment of institutes in guidance and counseling, although in somewhat different language. The differences of substance between the two versions are as follows:

(1) The House bill authorized the appropriation of \$6,000,000 for fiscal 1959, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, while the Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of \$6,250,000 for fiscal 1959, and \$7,250,000 for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

(2) The House bill, unlike the Senate amendment, contained a provision providing that the institutes would place emphasis upon the counseling and guidance of gifted students.

(3) Under the House bill a person employed by a public school system who is engaged in guidance and counseling on a full or part-time basis would receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week, plus \$15 a week for each dependent, except that no one would receive more than his last rate of salary during the preceding academic year. The Senate amendment provided for payments of stipends and allowances for dependents to personnel and teachers engaged in, or preparing to engage in, counseling and guidance in public secondary schools, but no maximum permissible amount was provided for such stipends and allowances.

The conference substitute adopts the language of the Senate amendment, except that the provisions of the House bill limiting the amount

of stipends to \$75 a week and of dependents' allowances to \$15 per dependent per week are included in the substitute.

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

The House bill and Senate amendment both authorized the Commissioner to contract for the operation by institutions of higher education during fiscal 1959 through fiscal 1962 of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers of any modern foreign language in schools at the elementary or secondary level. No specific authorization of appropriations is provided for such institutes in the House bill, but for carrying out all of title IV of the House bill (relating to language development), section 404 authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed \$4,500,000 for each of the 4 fiscal years of the program. The Senate amendment for each of the 4 fiscal years of the program authorizes the appropriation of \$7,250,000 for such institutes.

Both versions would also provide for the payment of stipends and dependents' allowances to persons attending the institutes. The House bill also provided for travel to and from their places of residence of individuals attending such institutes and their dependents. The Senate version has no similar provision.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the Senate version, except that it provides that a person attending a language institute shall be eligible (after application) therefor to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such person with 1 or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend of \$15 per week for each such dependent.

The House bill and the Senate amendment both provided for language and area centers and for research and studies in language instruction. The conference substitute is the same as the House bill, except that the appropriation of \$8,000,000 is authorized, instead of \$4,500,000, as provided in the House bill for all language development.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

The House bill authorized an appropriation of \$2 million a year for 4 years to enable the Commissioner of Education, through grants or contracts, to undertake functions detailed in paragraphs (1) through (5) of section 701 of the House bill, to enable him to provide (upon request) advice, counsel, and technical assistance to State or local educational agencies or institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize television, radio, motion pictures, and related communications media in providing education.

The Senate amendment authorized an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and \$10,000,000 for each of the 3 succeeding years to carry out research and experimentation (directly or through grant or contract) with respect to adaptation and utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related communications media for educational purposes and to disseminate information with respect to new educational media.

The Senate amendment also established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, and permitted the Commissioner of Education to secure (without regard to the civil-service laws) the assistance and advice of persons who are expert in the adaptation and utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and other related media of communication for educational purposes.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that (1) it would authorize the appropriation of \$3,000,000 for fiscal 1959 and \$5,000,000 for each of the next 3 fiscal years, and (2) it permits the Commissioner to carry out research and experimentation only through grants and contracts.

TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The Senate amendment included a title relating to area vocational programs which had no counterpart in the House bill. This title was designed to provide assistance to the States so that they could improve and expand their vocational education programs through area vocational education programs; approved by State boards as providing vocational and related technical training and retraining for youths, adults, and older persons, including related instruction for apprentices, designed to fit them for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in scientific and technical fields.

The title amends the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (the George-Barden Act) by adding the following new title:

TITLE III—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Section 301—Authorization of appropriations

This section authorizes appropriation of \$20,000,000 for fiscal 1959 and each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

Section 302—Allotments to States

The amounts appropriated are to be allotted to the States in the same ratio as the total amounts allotted under title I of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, the act of March 18, 1950, and section 9 of the act of August 1, 1956.

The amounts allotted to a State, but not required by it (according to its certification), would be available for reallocation to other States.

Section 303—Payments to States

The payments shall be made on the condition that the State will match the grants on a 50-50 basis and that the amounts granted will not be used to reduce State or local funds used for vocational education programs under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts, although State and local funds under those laws in excess of what is needed for 50-50 matching could be used to match the new Federal funds.

This section provides payments to the States on the basis of estimates, with necessary adjustments for overpayments or underpayments in previous periods, on a quarterly basis or any other period prescribed by the Commissioner. The payments could be made in installments determined by the Commissioner.

The section also provides that funds appropriated for this program will be used exclusively for training of individuals designed to fit them

for useful employment as highly skilled technicians or semiprofessional personnel in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields necessary for the national defense.

Section 304—Use of funds

Amounts allotted under this title could be used for administration, supervision, and teacher-training expenses; for salaries and travel expenses for school personnel; for travel expenses for advisory committees; for purchase and rental of instructional equipment (and maintenance and repair thereof) and purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids; for transportation of students; for securing necessary educational information for development of programs; for training and work experience for out-of-school youth; for related instruction for apprentices; and for determining the need for and planning of the programs.

Any equipment obtained by the use of the allotted funds would become State property.

Section 305—Additional State plan requirements

In order for a State to qualify for assistance under this title, its State plan must be amended to—

(1) Designate the State board as the sole agency for the plan's administration or provide for the supervision of its administration by State or local educational agencies;

(2) Set up minimum qualifications for persons having responsibilities under the plan;

(3) Outline specific plans, policies, and methods for carrying out the State plan;

(4) Provide for proper accounting and budgeting methods and provide for the making of necessary reports to the Commissioner.

Any plan meeting these requirements would be approved by the Commissioner.

If the Commissioner subsequently finds the State has failed to comply substantially with the above requirements in administration of the plan or because of a change in State plan, he shall, upon notifying the State board, stop further payments or limit such payments to parts of the plan not affected by such failure until such time as the State has complied with the requirements. Such action may only be taken after notice and opportunity for hearing has been accorded the State board.

The State may appeal the Commissioner's decision to the United States court of appeals. The summons and the notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact of the Commissioner are conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of evidence; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner for further evidence to be taken. The court would have jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the decision in whole or in part. The judgment of the court of appeals would be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Section 306—Appropriations for administration.

This section authorizes the inclusion in the appropriations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of such sums as shall be necessary to administer this new title of the George-Barden Act.

Section 307—Definitions

This section provides definitions of the terms listed below to be used for the purposes of the new title.

(1) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and Guam.

(2) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(3) The terms "State plan" and "State board" have the same meaning which said terms have in the act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114).

(4) The term "area vocational education program" means a program consisting of one or more less-than-college-grade courses conducted under public supervision and control and on an organized, systematic class basis, which is designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in recognized occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge, and which is made available to residents of the State or an area thereof designated and approved by the State board, who either have completed junior high school or, regardless of their school credits, are at least 16 years of age and can reasonably be expected to profit by the instruction offered.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that (1) the appropriations authorized are reduced to \$15,000,000 a year, and (2) the provision in the Senate amendment limiting the types of training for which the funds may be used is modified to delete the reference therein to "semiprofessional personnel" and to give the State boards of vocational education the function of determining what are "recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge." Courses in public colleges or public junior colleges, which are not offered toward a baccalaureate degree and meet other criteria of "less-than-college-grade" courses, could be included by the State board under this program just as they are today under the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts.

TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

Under this provision of the Senate amendment the National Science Foundation would be required to establish a Science Information Service. The Foundation, through the Service, would provide for indexing, abstracting, translating and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information. It would also undertake to develop improved methods for making scientific information available.

The Senate amendment provided for the establishment of a Science Information Council by the National Science Foundation within the Foundation to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to, the head of the Science Information Service. The Council would consist of the Librarian of Congress, the Director of the National Library of Medicine, the Director of the Department of Agriculture Library, and the Head of the Science Information Service, as ex officio members. Fifteen additional members would be appointed by the Director of the National Science Foundation. Six of the appointed members would be experts in the fields of science, six leaders in librarianship and scientific documentation; and three representatives of the lay public interested in the fields of communication. The

appointments are for a term of 4 years, except that in order to provide for staggered terms, 4 of the members first appointed will serve for a term of 3 years, 4 for a term of 2 years, and 3 for a term of 1 year. If a member is appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term, the appointment shall be only for the remainder of such term. No member may be reappointed until after 1 year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term. The Council is to meet at least twice a year or more often if necessary.

The National Science Foundation would have the same power and authority under this title that it has under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. Under the Senate amendment, all the grants under the title were required to be approved by the National Science Board.

The title authorized the appropriation, starting with the fiscal year which ends June 30, 1959, of such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the title.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts this Senate provision with the single exception that the provision which requires grants to be approved by the National Science Board was deleted as unnecessary in light of certain recent enactments.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

The Senate amendment authorized the delegation by the Commissioner to any officer or employee of the Office of Education of any of his functions under this act, other than the making of regulations. The conference substitute accepts this provision.

Under the Senate amendment no one could receive a grant or loan from funds made available under the act until he executes and files a non-Communist affidavit and has taken an oath of allegiance to the United States. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment.

The substitute adopted by the conferees does not include provisions which were in the House bill authorizing the Commissioner to accept gifts, grants, bequests, or devises for carrying out the provisions of the act. There were no comparable provisions in the Senate amendment.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
CARL ELLIOTT,
LEE METCALF,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
H. G. HASKELL, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.



Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the legislative business and other special orders heretofore entered into, I might have permission to address the House for 30 minutes for the purpose of paying tribute to Representative KARL M. LECOMPTÉ of Iowa, who is retiring from Congress at the end of this session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN on the last day of the session and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD, for 20 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HUDDLESTON in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ULLMAN and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK in two instances, and include an article in each.

Mr. WALTER in two instances.

Mr. MACK of Illinois in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL and include an article, notwithstanding it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$182.25.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FALLON.

Mr. LANE in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LIPSCOMB in three instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLLEFSON in three instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER in five instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED in 10 instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

Mr. MCGOVERN in five instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio, in three instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. FALLON in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Alabama in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. WHITENER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina in two instances and in each to include an article.

All Members were granted permission (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of Texas) to extend their remarks in the RECORD immediately preceding the vote on the bill, S. 4036.

Mr. DINGELL to immediately follow the remarks by Mr. HARRIS, of Arkansas yesterday on the bill, H. R. 9521, appearing at page 17285 of the RECORD.

Mrs. KEE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GRANAHAN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANTANGELO in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK.

All Members were granted 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in connection with Senate Concurrent Resolution 109 (at the request of Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. UDALL in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN to extend his remarks at that point in the proceedings of today following the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] offering an amendment to the minerals bill.

Mr. COLLIER in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAMER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. BERRY in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an article.

(At the request of Mr. BALDWIN and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. CANFIELD.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in five instances.

Mr. MCINTOSH in five instances.

Mr. COLLIER in five instances.

Mr. KEARNS.

At the request of Mr. MACK of Illinois, the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter in each instance, as follows:

Mr. WRIGHT at the point in the RECORD immediately prior to the passage of H. R. 13191.

Mr. POLK in six instances.

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in five instances.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia.

Mr. HEMPHILL in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3287. An act for the relief of Vivian D. Giesey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4109. An act for the relief of Dr. Herbert H. Schafer and his wife, Irma Niemeyer Schafer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4113. An act for the relief of Harold Pangelinian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser;

H. R. 2265. An act for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4991. An act for the relief of Waldo E. Miller;

H. R. 5497. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maude L. Smith;

H. R. 6238. An act to amend section 1292 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to appeals from Interlocutory orders;

H. R. 6595. An act for the relief of Markus H. Teitel;

H. R. 7178. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Metzger.

H. R. 7337. An act for the relief of James McGuire;

H. R. 7374. An act for the relief of Angelo Sardo;

H. R. 7499. An act for the relief of the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.;

H. R. 7685. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eldrey L. Whaley;

H. R. 8014. An act for the relief of Miss Edith Dorn;

H. R. 8184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Hall;

H. R. 8735. An act to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9407. An act to provide additional opportunity for certain Government employees to obtain career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service;

H. R. 9500. An act to permit certain sales and exchanges of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to certain persons who suffered a substantial loss of real property by reason of the tidal wave of March 9, 1957;

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States in January 1961, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging; and for related purposes;

H. R. 9833. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920;

H. R. 10587. An act for the relief of Homer G. Preston;

H. R. 10733. An act for the relief of Magnolia Airport, Inc.;

H. R. 10813. An act for the relief of Maj. Anthony R. Parrish;

H. R. 10993. An act for the relief of Kilko Nemoto;

H. R. 11078. An act to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes;

H. R. 11156. An act for the relief of Duncan Moore and his wife, Marjorie Moore;

H. R. 11200. An act for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased;

H. R. 11239. An act for the relief of James F. Moran;

H. R. 11299. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Tarsi Priori;

H. R. 12144. An act for the relief of Paul E. Nolan;

H. R. 12154. An act for the relief of Ernest T. Stephens;

H. R. 12365. An act for the relief of the estate of Suck Pil Ra;

H. R. 12632. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 12655. An act for the relief of S. Jackson & Son, Inc.;

H. R. 12662. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12663. An act to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12867. An act for the relief of Clayton T. Wells;

H. R. 12906. An act for the relief of Anne-liese Ottolenghi;

H. R. 13132. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955;

H. R. 13406. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended;

H. R. 13437. An act for the relief of Bernard H. English and John E. Hayden;

H. R. 13500. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the Hanson, Co., and Houma Canals, La., and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to amend the act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission;

H. J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain real property in the District of Columbia for the proposed Southwest Freeway and for the redevelopment of the southwest area in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 654. Joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Commerce to submit certain recommendations for legislation for the purpose of assisting Congress to determine whether or not to reimburse States for certain highways on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1258. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Guerdon Plumley;

S. 3195. An act to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries;

S. 3776. An act to extend the time for the collection of tolls to amortize the cost, in-

cluding reasonable interest and financing cost, of the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.;

S. 4169. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to participation by the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization; and

S. 4273. An act to provide for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Commission.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7125. An act to make technical changes in the Federal excise tax laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13518. An act to incorporate the Blinded Veterans Association; and

H. J. Res. 585. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on service to Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties from the Central Valley project, California.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 13247 to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2688)

[To accompany H. R. 13247]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the 'National Defense Education Act of 1958'."

"TABLE OF CONTENTS"

"Title I—General provisions"

"Sec. 101. Findings and declaration of policy.

"Sec. 102. Federal control of education prohibited.

"Sec. 103. Definitions.

"Title II—Loans to students in institutions of higher education"

"Sec. 201. Appropriations authorized.

"Sec. 202. Allotments to States.

"Sec. 203. Payment of Federal capital contributions.

"Sec. 204. Conditions of agreements.

"Sec. 205. Terms of loans.

"Sec. 206. Distributions of assets from student loan funds.

"Sec. 207. Loans to institutions.

"Sec. 208. Payments to cover reductions in amounts of loans.

"Sec. 209. Administrative provisions.

"Title III—Financial assistance for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction"

"Sec. 301. Appropriations authorized.

"Sec. 302. Allotments to States.

"Sec. 303. State plans.

"Sec. 304. Payments to States.

"Sec. 305. Loans to nonprofit private schools.

"Title IV—National defense fellowships"

"Sec. 401. Appropriations authorized.

"Sec. 402. Number of fellowships.

"Sec. 403. Award of fellowships and approval of institutions.

"Sec. 404. Fellowship stipends.

"Sec. 405. Fellowship conditions.

"Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing; identification and encouragement of able students"

"Part A—State Programs"

"Sec. 501. Appropriations authorized.

"Sec. 502. Allotments to States.

"Sec. 503. State plans.

"Sec. 504. Payments to States.

"Part B—Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes"

"Sec. 511. Authorization.

"Title VI—Language development"

"Part A—Centers and Research and Studies"

"Sec. 601. Language and area centers.

"Sec. 602. Research and studies.

"Sec. 603. Appropriations authorized.

"Part B—Language Institutes"

"Sec. 611. Authorization.

"Title VII—Research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes"

"Part A—Research and Experimentation"

"Sec. 701. Functions of the Commissioner.

"Sec. 702. Grants-in-aid; contracts.

"Part B—Dissemination of Information on New Educational Media"

"Sec. 731. Functions of the Commissioner.

"Part C—General Provisions"

"Sec. 761. Establishment of the advisory committee.

"Sec. 762. Special personnel.

"Sec. 763. Appropriations authorized.

"Title VIII—Area vocational education programs"

"Sec. 801. Statement of findings and purpose.

"Sec. 802. Amendment to Vocational Education Act of 1946.

"Title IX—Science information service"

"Sec. 901. Functions of the service.

"Sec. 902. Science information council.

"Sec. 903. Authority for certain grants and contracts.

"Sec. 904. Appropriations authorized.

"Title X—Miscellaneous provisions"

"Sec. 1001. Administration.

"Sec. 1002. Advisory committees.

"Sec. 1003. Exemption from conflict-of-interest laws of members of advisory committees or information council.

"Sec. 1004. Administration of State plans.

"Sec. 1005. Judicial review.

"Sec. 1006. Method of payment.

"Sec. 1007. Administrative appropriations authorized.

"Sec. 1008. Allotments to Territories and possessions.

"Sec. 1009. Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

"TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Findings and declaration of policy

"SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles. It depends as well upon the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge.

"We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology.

"The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense.

"To meet the present educational emergency requires additional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

"Federal control of education prohibited

"SEC. 102. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

"Definitions

"SEC. 103. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'State' means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, except that as used in section 302 and 502, such term does not include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

"(b) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II, such term includes any private business school or technical institution which meets

the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"(c) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(d) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(e) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

"(f) The term 'school-age population' means that part of the population which is between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive, and such school-age population for the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the population between such ages for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(g) The term 'elementary school' means a school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

"(h) The term 'secondary school' means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12. For the purposes of sections 301 through 304, the term 'secondary school' may include a public junior college, as determined under State law.

"(i) The term 'public' as applied to any school or institution does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

"(j) The term 'nonprofit,' as applied to a school or institution, means a school or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and, for purposes of part A of title V, includes a school of any agency of the United States.

"(k) The term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

"TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 201. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in such institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$47,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, \$82,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, \$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or complete their education. Sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agreement between the Commissioner and institutions of higher education, for payment of Federal capital contributions which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan funds.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 202. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1962, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all of the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

"(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year ending after June 30, 1962, shall be allotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purpose for which such amounts are appropriated.

"Payment of Federal capital contributions

"SEC. 203. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which institutions of higher education in a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions from the allotment of such State. In the event the total requested in such applications, which are made by institutions with which he has agreements under this title and which meet the requirements established in regulations of the Commissioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to the total requested in all such applications. In the event the total requested in such applications which are made by institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Commissioner may reallocate the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under section 202 for such year. The Federal capital contribution to an institution shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan fund established under its agreement under this title.

"(b) In no case may the total of such Federal capital contributions to any institution of higher education for any fiscal year exceed \$250,000.

"Conditions of agreements

"SEC. 204. An agreement with any institution of higher education for Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner under this title shall—

"(1) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by such institution;

"(2) provide for deposit in such fund of (A) the Federal capital contributions, (B) an amount, equal to not less than one-ninth of such Federal capital contributions, contributed by such institution, (C) collections of principal and interest on student loans made from such fund, and (D) any other earnings of the fund;

"(3) provide that such student loan fund shall be used only for loans to students in accordance with such agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this title, and for costs of litigation arising in connection with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest on such loan;

"(4) provide that in the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund special consideration shall be

given to (A) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (B) students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language; and

"(5) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this title and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the institution.

"Terms of loans

"SEC. 205. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year to any student made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed \$1,000, and the total for all years to any student from such funds may not exceed \$5,000.

"(b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by any institution of higher education shall be made on such terms and conditions as the institution may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the institution) with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of study; and except that—

"(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate or graduate student;

"(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount, together with interest thereon, in equal annual installments, or, if the borrower so requests, in graduated periodic installments (determined in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner), over a period beginning one year after the date on which the borrower ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education and ending eleven years after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on any such loan, and periodic installments need not be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education, or (ii) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, (B) any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period during which the repayment must be completed, (C) such ten-year period may also be extended for good cause determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and (D) the borrower may at his option accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan;

"(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school in a State, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each complete academic year of such service;

"(4) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum except that no interest shall accrue before the date on which repayment of the loan is to begin;

"(5) such a loan shall be made without security and without endorsement, except

that, if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required;

"(6) the liability to repay any such loan shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

"(7) such a loan by an institution for any year shall be made in such installments as may be provided in regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with the institution under this title and, upon notice to the Commissioner by the institution that any recipient of a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld, as may be appropriate; and

"(8) no note or other evidence of such a loan may be transferred or assigned by the institution of higher education making the loan except, upon the transfer of the borrower to another institution of higher education participating in the program under this title (or, if not participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by the Commissioner for such purpose), to such institution.

"(c) An agreement under this title for payment of Federal capital contributions shall include provisions designed to make loans from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement reasonably available (to the extent of the available funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such institution in need thereof.

"Distributions of assets from student loan funds

"SEC. 206. (a) After June 30, 1966, and not later than September 30, 1966, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the student loan fund established under this title by each institution of higher education as follows:

"(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1966, as the total amount of the Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Commissioner under this title bears to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the institution's capital contributions to such fund.

"(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the institution.

"(b) After September 30, 1966, each institution with which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this title shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the institution after June 30, 1966, in payment of principal or interest on student loans made from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of litigation incurred in collection of the principal or interest on loans from the fund and not already reimbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of principal or interest) as was determined for the Commissioner under subsection (a).

"(c) Upon a finding by the institution or the Commissioner prior to July 1, 1966, that the liquid assets of a student loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this title exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the foreseeable future, and upon notice to such institution or to the Commissioner, as the case may be, there shall be, subject to such limitations as may be included in regulations of the Commissioner or in such agreement, a capital distribution from such fund. Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

"(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed as the Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner

to the student loan fund prior to such distribution bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the capital contributions to the fund made by the institution.

"(2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall be paid to the institution.

"Loans to institutions

"SEC. 207. (a) Upon application by any institution of higher education with which he has made an agreement under this title, the Commissioner may make a loan to such institution for the purpose of helping to finance the institution's capital contributions to a student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Any such loan may be made only if such institution shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this title. Loans made to institutions under this section shall bear interest at a rate which the Commissioner determines to be adequate to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this section, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, but not to exceed a total of \$25,000,000.

"(c) Loans made by the Commissioner under this section shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Commissioner to be appropriate in each case, but not exceeding fifteen years.

"Payments to cover reductions in amounts of loans

"SEC. 208. In addition to the payments otherwise authorized to be made pursuant to this title, the Commissioner shall pay to the appropriate institution, at such time or times as he determines, an amount which bears the same ratio to the interest which has been prevented from accruing and the portion of the principal which has been cancelled on student loans pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 205 (b) (and not previously paid pursuant to this subsection) as the total amount of the institution's capital contributions to such fund under this title bears to the sum of such institution's capital contributions and the Federal capital contributions to such fund.

"Administrative provisions

"SEC. 209. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the other powers conferred upon him by this title, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this title and to compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title.

"(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

"TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for (1) making payments to State educational agencies under this title for the acquisition of equip-

ment (suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language) and for minor remodeling described in paragraph (1) of section 303 (a), and (2) making loans authorized in section 305. There are also authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agencies under this title to carry out the programs described in paragraph (5) of section 303 (a).

"Allotments to States"

"SEC. 302. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 301 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008, and shall reserve 12 per centum for loans authorized in section 305. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

"(A) the school-age population of the State, and

"(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)),

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

"(2) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the continental United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 33⅓ per centum or more than 66⅔ per centum. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1959, on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1960, and the second shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1962.

"(3) For the purposes of this title—

"(A) The term 'child of school age' means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

"(B) The term 'continental United States' does not include Alaska.

"(C) The term 'income per child of school age' for any State or for the continental United States means the total personal income for the State and the continental United States, respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in such State and in the continental United States, respectively.

"(4) A State's allotment under this subsection shall remain available for payment pursuant to section 304 (a) for projects in such State until the end of the fiscal year following the year for which the allotment is made.

"(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the second sentence of section 301 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any

fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

"State plans"

"SEC. 303. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and—

"(1) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 302 (a) will be expended solely for projects approved by the State educational agency for (A) acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audio-visual materials and equipment and printed materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language, in public elementary or secondary schools, or both, and (B) minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such materials or equipment;

"(2) sets forth principles for determining the priority of such projects in the State for assistance under this title and provides for undertaking such projects insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

"(3) provides an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency to any applicant for a project under this title;

"(4) provides for the establishment of standards on a State level for laboratory and other special equipment acquired with assistance furnished under this title;

"(5) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 302 (b) will be expended solely for (A) expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in public elementary and secondary schools in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and (B) administration of the State plan.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

"Payments to States"

"SEC. 304. (a) From a State's allotment for a fiscal year under section 302 (a), the Commissioner shall, from time to time during the period such allotment is available for payment as provided in paragraph (4) of section 302 (a), pay to such State an amount equal to one-half of the expenditures for projects for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling referred to in paragraph (1) of section 303 (a) which are carried out under its State plan approved under section 303 (b); except that no State shall receive payments under this subsection for any period in excess of its allotments for such period under section 302 (a).

"(b) From a State's allotment under section 302 (b) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner shall from time to time pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended by such State for such year to carry out the program referred to in paragraph (5) of section 303 (a) under its State plan approved under section 303 (b). From a State's allotment under section 302 (b) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal one-half of the amount so expended under its State plan approved under section 303 (b); except that no State shall receive payments under this subsection for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under section 302 (b) for that fiscal year.

"Loans to nonprofit private schools"

"SEC. 305. (a) The Commissioner shall allot, out of funds reserved for each fiscal year for the purposes of this section under the provisions of section 302 (a), to each State for loans under the provisions of this section an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as the number of persons in such State enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools bears to the total of such numbers for all States.

"(b) From the sums allotted to each State under the provisions of this section the Commissioner is authorized to make loans to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in such State for the purposes for which payments to State educational agencies are authorized under the first sentence of section 301. Any such loan—

"(1) shall be made upon application containing such information as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioner;

"(2) shall be subject to such conditions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

"(3) shall bear interest at the rate arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 percent per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the date the application for the loan is approved and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent; and

"(4) shall mature and be repayable on such date as may be agreed to by the Commissioner and the borrower, but such date shall not be more than 10 years after the date on which such loan was made.

"TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS"

"Appropriations authorized"

"SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Number of fellowships"

"SEC. 402. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner is authorized to award one thousand fellowships under the provisions of this title, and during each of the three succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award one thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellowships shall be for periods of study not in excess of three academic years.

"Award of fellowships and approval of institutions"

"SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioner shall award fellowships under this title to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by him under this section. The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding:

"(1) that such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded,

"(2) that such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation, and

"(3) that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs preference will be given to persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education.

"(b) The total of the fellowships awarded under this title for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program at any institution of higher education may not exceed a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the objective referred to in subsection (a) (2).

"Fellowship stipends"

"SEC. 404. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title

shall receive a stipend of \$2,000 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate degree, \$2,200 for the second such year, and \$2,400 for the third such year, plus an additional amount of \$400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

"(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study such amount, not more than \$2,500 per academic year, as is determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the new graduate program or of the expansion in an existing graduate program in which such person is pursuing his course of study, which is reasonably attributable to him.

"Fellowship conditions

"SEC. 405. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 404 only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities, approved by the Commissioner.

"TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

"Part A—State programs

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 501. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making grants to State educational agencies under this part to assist them to establish and maintain programs of testing and guidance and counseling.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 502. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total of increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

"State Plans

"SEC. 503. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and sets forth—

"(1) a program for testing students in the public secondary schools, and if authorized by law in other secondary schools, of such State to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and

"(2) a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools of such State (A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (B) to encourage students with

outstanding aptitude and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

"Payments to States

"SEC. 504. (a) Payment under this part shall be made to those State educational agencies which administer plans approved under section 503. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, such payments shall equal the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal one-half of the amount so expended; except that no State educational agency shall receive payment under this part for any fiscal year in excess of that State's allotment for that fiscal year as determined under section 502.

"(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 503 and in which the State educational agency is not authorized by law to make payments to cover the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools in such State to determine student abilities and aptitudes, the Commissioner shall arrange for the testing of such students and shall pay the cost thereof for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and one-half of the cost thereof for any of the three succeeding fiscal years out of such State's allotment. Testing of students pursuant to this subsection shall, so far as practicable, be comparable to, and be done at the same grade levels and under the same conditions as in the case of, testing of students in public schools under the State plan.

"Part B—Counseling and guidance training institutes

"Authorization

"SEC. 511. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$6,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and \$7,250,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, by contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for the provision of training to improve the qualifications of personnel engaged in counseling and guidance of students in secondary schools, or teachers in such schools preparing to engage in such counseling and guidance. Each individual, engaged, or preparing to engage, in counseling and guidance in a public secondary school, who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance.

"TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

"Part A—Centers and research and studies

"Language and Area Centers

"SEC. 601. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, of centers for the teaching of any modern foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner determines (1) that individuals trained in such language are needed by the Federal Government or by business, industry, or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States. Any such

contract may provide for instruction not only in such modern foreign language but also in other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used, to the extent adequate instruction in such fields is not readily available, including fields such as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology. Any such contract may cover not more than 50 per centum of the cost of the establishment and operation of the center with respect to which it is made, including the cost of grants to the staff for travel in the foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject matter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working is concerned and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to such centers to teach or assist in teaching therein and the cost of their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Commissioner is also authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals undergoing advanced training in any modern foreign language (with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a)), and other fields needed for a full understanding of the area, region, or country in which such language is commonly used, at any short-term or regular session of any institution of higher education, including allowances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of residence, but only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients of such stipends will, on completion of their training, be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an institution of higher education or for such other service of a public nature as may be permitted in regulations of the Commissioner.

"Research and studies

"SEC. 602. The Commissioner is authorized, directly or by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages and other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in such training, or in training teachers of such languages or in such fields.

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 603. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part, not to exceed \$8,000,000 in any one fiscal year.

"Part B—Language institutes

"Authorization

"SEC. 611. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$7,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign language in elementary or secondary schools. Each individual (engaged, or preparing to engage, in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign language in a public elementary or secondary school) who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall

receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance.

"TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

"Part A—Research and experimentation

"Functions of the Commissioner

"SEC. 701. In carrying out the provisions of this part the Commissioner, in cooperation with the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media (established by section 761), shall (through grants or contracts) conduct, assist, and foster research and experimentation in the development and evaluation of projects involving television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication which may prove of value to State or local educational agencies in the operation of their public elementary or secondary schools, and to institutions of higher education, including the development of new and more effective techniques and methods—

"(1) for utilizing and adapting motion pictures, video tapes and other audio-visual aids, film strips, slides and other visual aids, recordings (including magnetic tapes) and other auditory aids, and radio or television program scripts for such purposes;

"(2) for training teachers to utilize such media with maximum effectiveness; and

"(3) for presenting academic subject matter through such media.

"Grants-in-Aid; Contracts

"SEC. 702. In carrying out the provisions of section 701, the Commissioner—

"(1) may make grants-in-aid, approved by the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and individuals for projects of research or experimentation referred to in section 701;

"(2) may enter into contracts, approved by the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, with public or private agencies, organizations, groups, and individuals for projects of research or experimentation referred to in section 701; and

"(3) shall promote the coordination of programs conducted or financed by him under this title with similar programs conducted by other agencies, institutions, foundations, organizations, or individuals.

"Part B—Dissemination of information on new educational media

"Functions of the Commissioner

"SEC. 731. In order to disseminate information concerning new educational media (including the results of research and experimentation conducted under part A of this title) to State or local educational agencies, for use in their public elementary or secondary schools, and to institutions of higher education, the Commissioner—

"(1) shall make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication by State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education for educational purposes;

"(2) shall prepare and publish catalogs, reviews, bibliographies, abstracts, analyses of research and experimentation, and such other materials as are generally useful in the encouragement and more effective use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication for educational purposes;

"(3) may, upon request, provide advice, counsel, technical assistance, and demonstrations to State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize such media of communication to increase the quality or depth or broaden the scope of their educational programs;

"(4) shall prepare and publish an annual report setting forth (A) projects carried out under this title and the cost of each such project, and (B) developments in the utilization and adaptation of media of communication for educational purposes; and

"(5) may enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals to carry out the provisions of this part.

"Part C—General provisions

"Establishment of the Advisory Committee

"SEC. 761. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on New Educational Media (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Advisory Committee"). The Advisory Committee shall consist of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, a representative of the National Science Foundation and twelve persons appointed, without regard to the civil-service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Three of such appointed members shall be individuals identified with the sciences, liberal arts, or modern foreign languages in institutions of higher education; three shall be individuals actually engaged in teaching or in the supervision of teaching in elementary or secondary schools; three shall be individuals of demonstrated ability in the utilization or adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication for educational purposes; and three shall be individuals representative of the lay public who have demonstrated an interest in the problems of communication media.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall—

"(1) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Commissioner on matters relating to the utilization or adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, or related media of communication for educational purposes, and on matters of basic policy arising in the administration of this title;

"(2) review all applications for grants-in-aid under part A of this title for projects of research or experimentation and certify approval to the Commissioner of any such projects which it believes are appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title; and

"(3) review all proposals by the Commissioner to enter into contracts under this title and certify approval to the Commissioner of any such contracts which it believes are appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(c) The Commissioner may utilize the services of any member or members of the Advisory Committee in connection with matters relating to the provisions of this title, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

"(d) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on business of the Advisory Committee or at the request of the Commissioner under subsection (c) of this section, receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, not to exceed \$50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

"Special Personnel

"SEC. 762. The Commissioner may secure from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, without regard to the civil-service laws, the assistance and advice of persons in the United States and from abroad who are experts in the utilization and adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, and other related media of communication for educational purposes.

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 763. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the sum of \$15,000,000 for each of the three succeed-

ing fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"Statement of Findings and Purpose

"SEC. 801. The Congress hereby finds that the excellent programs of vocational education, which States have established and are carrying on with the assistance provided by the Federal Government under the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (the George-Barden Act), need extension to provide vocational education to residents of areas inadequately served and also to meet national defense requirements for personnel equipped to render skilled assistance in fields particularly affected by scientific and technological developments. It is therefore the purpose of this title to provide assistance to the States so that they may improve their vocational education programs through area vocational education programs approved by State boards of vocational education as providing vocational and related technical training and retraining for youths, adults, and older persons, including related instruction for apprentices, designed to fit them for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in scientific or technical fields.

"Amendment to Vocational Education Act of 1946

"SEC. 802. The Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 151-15m, 15o-15q, 15aa-15jj) is amended by adding after title II the following new title:

"TITLE III—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 301. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years the sum of \$15,000,000 for area vocational education programs, to be apportioned for expenditure in the States as provided in section 302.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 301, each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the total of the amounts apportioned under title I of this Act, the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31-33), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U. S. C. 34), to such State for such year bears to the total of the amounts so apportioned to all the States for such year.

"(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State certifies to the Commissioner will not be required for carrying out area vocational education programs (under the part of the State plan meeting the requirements of section 305) shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year. Any amount so reallocated to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a).

"Payments to States

"SEC. 303. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 302 for any fiscal year shall be paid on condition:

"(1) that there shall be spent for such year an equal amount in State or local funds, or both, for area vocational education programs operated under the provisions of this title;

"(2) that funds appropriated under this title will not be used to reduce the amount of State or local funds, or both, being spent for vocational education programs operated under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Voca-

tional Education Act and titles I and II of this Act and reported to the Commissioner, but such State or local funds, or both, in excess of the amount necessary for dollar for dollar matching of funds allotted to a State under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I and II of this Act may be used to match funds appropriated under this title;

"(3) that funds appropriated under section 301 of this title shall be used exclusively for the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge, as determined by the State board for such State, in fields necessary for the national defense.

"(b) The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State for area vocational education programs under this title for such period; and shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this subsection) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for any prior period for such purpose under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under this title for such purpose. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine.

"Use of Funds

"SEC. 304. (a) Funds paid to a State under this title for area vocational education programs may be used, in carrying out such programs (under the part of the State plan meeting the requirements of section 305), for—

"(1) maintenance of adequate programs of administration, supervision, and teacher-training;

"(2) salaries and necessary travel expenses of State or local school personnel, including teachers, coordinators, supervisors, vocational guidance counselors, teacher-trainers, directors, administrators, and others;

"(3) travel expenses of members of advisory committees or State boards;

"(4) purchase, rental, or other acquisition, and maintenance and repair, of instructional equipment;

"(5) purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids;

"(6) necessary costs of transportation of students;

"(7) securing necessary educational information and data as a basis for the proper development of area vocational education programs and programs of vocational guidance;

"(8) training and work-experience training programs for out-of-school youths;

"(9) related instruction for apprentices; and

"(10) determining the need for, and planning and developing, area vocational education programs.

"(b) Any equipment and teaching aids purchased with funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title shall become the property of the State.

"Additional State Plan Requirements

"SEC. 305. (a) To be eligible to participate in this title the State plan must be amended to include a new part which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of such part of the plan (or for the supervision of the administration thereof by State or local educational agencies);

"(2) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, di-

rectors and others having responsibilities under the plan;

"(3) shows the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out such part of the State plan;

"(4) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of such part of the State plan; and

"(5) provides that the State board will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this title.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve a part of any plan for purposes of this title if he finds that it fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board finds that—

"(1) the part of the State plan approved under subsection (b) has been so changed that it no longer complies with any provision required by subsection (a) of this section to be included in such part; or

"(2) in the administration of such part of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State from its allotments under section 302 (or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for projects under or portions of such part of the State plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State from its allotments under section 302 (or shall limit payments to projects under or portions of such part of the State plan in which there is no such failure).

"(d) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action under subsection (c) of this section, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"Appropriations for Administration

"SEC. 306. There are hereby authorized to be included for each fiscal year in the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as are necessary to administer the provisions of this title.

"Definitions

"SEC. 307. For purposes of this title—

"(a) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and Guam.

"(b) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

"(c) The terms "State plan" and "State board" shall have the meaning which said terms have in the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114).

"(d) The term "area vocational education program" means a program consisting of one or more less-than-college-grade courses conducted under public supervision and control and on an organized, systematic class basis, which is designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in recognized occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge, and which is made available to residents of the State or an area thereof designated and approved by the State board, who either have completed junior high school or, regardless of their school credits, are at least sixteen years of age and can reasonably be expected to profit by the instruction offered.

"TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

"Functions of the Service

SEC. 901. The National Science Foundation shall establish a Science Information Service. The Foundation, through such Service, shall (1) provide, or arrange for the provision of, indexing, abstracting, translating, and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information, and (2) undertake programs to develop new or improved methods, including mechanized systems, for making scientific information available.

"Science Information Council

"SEC. 902. (a) The National Science Foundation shall establish, in the Foundation, a Science Information Council (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Council") consisting of the Librarian of Congress, the director of the National Library of Medicine, the director of the Department of Agriculture library, and the head of the Science Information Service, each of whom shall be ex officio members, and fifteen members appointed by the Director of the National Science Foundation. The Council shall annually elect one of the appointed members to serve as chairman until the next election. Six of the appointed members shall be leaders in the fields of fundamental science, six shall be leaders in the fields of librarianship and scientific documentation, and three shall be outstanding representatives of the lay public who have demonstrated interest in the problems of communication. Each appointed member of such Council shall hold office for a term of four years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term, and (2) of the members first appointed, four shall hold office for a term of three years, four shall hold office for a term of two years, and three shall hold office for a term of one year, as designated by the Director of the National Science Foundation at the time of appointment. No appointed member of the Council shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Council to advise, to consult with, and to make recommendations to, the head of the Science Information Service. The Council shall meet at least twice each year, and at such other times as the majority thereof deems appropriate.

"(c) Persons appointed to the Council shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at rates fixed by the National Science Foundation, but not to exceed \$50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and neces-

sary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

"Authority for Certain Grants and Contracts"

"SEC. 903. In carrying out its functions under this title, the National Science Foundation shall have the same power and authority it has under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to carry out its functions under that Act.

"Appropriations Authorized"

"SEC. 904. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS"

"Administration"

"SEC. 1001. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the titles of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U. S. C., sec. 5), of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

"(c) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the activities of the Office of Education under this Act, including recommendations for needed revisions in the provisions thereof.

"(d) The Secretary shall advise and consult with the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs with a view to securing full information concerning all specialized scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs administered by or under any such department or agency and to developing policies and procedures which will strengthen the educational programs and objectives of the institutions of higher education utilized for such purposes by any such department or agency.

"(e) Any agency of the Federal Government shall exercise its functions under any other law in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding or limiting the authority of any such agency under any other law.

"(f) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.' The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

"Advisory Committees"

"SEC. 1002. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may appoint an advisory committee, or advisory committees, to advise and consult with him with respect to the administration of the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible. Any

such committee shall have twelve members as follows:

"(1) Four members who are recognized scholars in any of the following fields: engineering, mathematics, or science;

"(2) Four members who are recognized scholars in any of the fields of the humanities; and

"(3) Four members from such fields of endeavor as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

Members of an advisory committee appointed under this section, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$50 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Exemption From Conflict-of-Interest Laws of Members of Advisory Committees or Information Council"

"SEC. 1003. (a) Any member of an advisory committee or information council appointed under this Act is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The exemption granted by subsection (a) shall not extend—

"(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

"(2) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

"Administration of State Plans"

"SEC. 1004. (a) No State plan submitted under one of the titles of this Act shall be approved by the Commissioner which does not—

"(1) provide, in the case of a plan submitted under title III or under title V, or section 1009 of this title, that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

"(2) provide that such commission or agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under such title or section; and

"(3) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under such title or section.

"(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof without first affording the agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the agency administering a State plan approved under one of the titles of this Act, finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this Act governing its original approval, or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner

shall notify such State agency, in the case of a plan submitted under title III or V or section 1009 of this title, that no further payments will be made to the State under such title or section (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure),

until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under such title or section, as the case may be (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"Judicial Review"

"SEC. 1005. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this Act, or with respect to his final action under section 1004 (c), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file in the United States district court for the district in which the capital of the State is located, a petition to review such action. The petition for review shall (1) contain a concise statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based and (2) designate that part of the Commissioner's decision sought to be reviewed.

"(b) Notification of the filing of the petition for review shall be given by the clerk of the court by mailing a copy of the petition to the Commissioner.

"(c) No costs or docket fees shall be charged or imposed with respect to any judicial review proceedings, or appeal therefrom, taken under this Act.

"(d) Upon receipt of the petition for review the Commissioner shall, within twenty days thereafter, certify and file in the court the record on review, consisting of the complete transcript of the proceedings before the Commissioner. No party to such review shall be required, by rule of court or otherwise, to print the contents of such record filed in the court.

"(e) The court after review may dismiss the petition or deny the relief prayed for, or may suspend, modify, or set aside, in whole or in part, the action of the Commissioner, or may compel action unlawfully withheld. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review, as provided in section 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"Method of Payment"

"SEC. 1006. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant, loan, or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of grants or loans, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Administrative Appropriations Authorized"

"SEC. 1007. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act, including the administrative expenses of State commissions.

"Allotments to Territories and Possessions"

"SEC. 1008. The amounts reserved by the Commissioner under sections 302 and 502 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs for the type of assistance furnished under the part or title in which the section appears.

"Improvement of Statistical Services of State Educational Agencies"

"SEC. 1009. (a) For the purpose of assisting the States to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of educational

statistics provided by State and local reports and records and the methods and techniques for collecting and processing educational data and disseminating information about the condition and progress of education in the States, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, for grants to States under this section, such sums as the Congress may determine.

"(b) Grants under this section by the Commissioner shall be equal to one-half of the cost of State educational agency programs to carry out the purposes of this section, including (1) improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of statistical data supplied by local educational units, (2) the development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve as guides for local educational units, (3) the conduct of conferences and training for personnel of local educational units and of periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for records and reports, (4) improving methods for obtaining, from other State agencies within the State, educational data not collected by the State educational agency, or (5) expediting the processing and reporting of statistical data through installation and operation of mechanical equipment. The total of the payments to any State under this section for any fiscal year may not exceed \$50,000.

"(c) Payments with respect to any program of a State educational agency under this section may be made (1) only to the extent it is a new program or an addition to or expansion of an existing program, and (2) only if the State plan approved under subsection (d) includes such program.

"(d) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for purposes of this section if such plan meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and sets forth the programs proposed to be carried out under the plan and the general policies to be followed in doing so."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
CARL ELLIOTT,
LEE METCALF,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
H. G. HASKELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
PAT McNAMARA,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The committee of conference agreed upon a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed upon in conference are noted in the following outline, except for minor, technical, and conforming changes.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The provisions of this title in the conference substitute are substantially the same as those in the House bill, except that

changes have been made in the findings and declaration of policy to make it consistent with the agreement reached by the conferees.

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The provisions of the House bill enable the Commissioner to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study, and to make loans to institutions to enable them to establish the funds where necessary. The Senate provision for loans differed substantially. The conference substitute adopts the House bill, with several changes which are generally of minor importance. These changes are the following:

(1) The Senate amendment required no matching of Federal funds. The requirement in the House bill of 20 percent matching by colleges of Federal funds is reduced in the conference substitute to 10 percent matching.

(2) The House bill provided that interest on student loans would be at the rate of 2 percent per year while the student was in school and for one year thereafter. Thereafter the loan would bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per year. The Senate amendment, in its loan title, provided for interest at the rate of 2 percent per year, beginning one year after the student finished school. The conference substitute provides for interest at the rate of 3 percent per year, beginning one year after the borrower ceases to be a full-time student at an institution of higher education.

(3) The Senate amendment provided that the loan would be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school at the rate of 20 percent of the unpaid balance of the loan (plus interest thereon) for each academic year of such service. The conference substitute provides for the cancellation of one-half of the loan for teaching over a five-year period in public elementary or secondary schools.

(4) Under the House bill loans would be repaid in equal annual installments. The conference substitute adopts a provision of the Senate amendment making it explicit that repayments may be made in installments which are graduated.

(5) The conference substitute also adopts a provision, taken from the Senate amendment, suspending payments on principal, and interest accruals, while the borrower is in the Armed Forces (but not for more than three years).

(6) The House bill provided that loans shall be made without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. The conference substitute omits this provision.

(7) The conference substitute incorporates a provision of the Senate amendment that in making loans special consideration shall be given to persons whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign language, and primarily to persons with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

The House bill authorized the appropriation of \$60,000,000 for fiscal 1959 and each of the three succeeding fiscal years for making payments to State educational agencies for the acquisition of equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language and for minor remodeling of the laboratory or other space used for such material and equipment. The bill also authorized the appropriation of \$5,000,000 for making payments to the States

for expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and the administration of the State plan.

The Senate amendment follows the House bill with two exceptions.

First, the authorization of appropriations in the Senate amendment for laboratory equipment and minor remodeling was \$70,000,000 per year.

Secondly, the Senate amendment provided that 12 percent of the sums appropriated for laboratory equipment and minor remodeling would be used for making loans to private nonprofit schools. The sums available for loans would be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative numbers of children enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in the respective States. The loans would be made for the same purposes that the grants could be made under the title. The loans would bear interest at one-quarter of 1 percent per year above the rate equal to the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States (adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent), and shall mature not later than 10 years after the loan is made.

The conference substitute is substantially the same as the Senate amendment.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for the award of 1,000 fellowships for fiscal 1959, and 1,500 such fellowships for each of the next three fiscal years, for periods of study not in excess of three academic years. The only difference between the two versions was a provision in the House bill that the fellowships be awarded without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

Part A—State programs

Both versions provide substantially similar programs of Federal assistance in the establishment and maintenance of programs of testing and guidance and counseling. The Senate amendment differs from the House bill in providing that where a State participating in the program is not authorized to use State funds for testing students in private nonprofit secondary schools to determine aptitude and ability, the Commissioner may arrange for testing such students, and would pay the cost thereof for fiscal 1959, and one-half the cost thereof for any of the three succeeding fiscal years, out of the State's allotment. This testing program would be comparable to that carried out in the public schools. The conference substitute is substantially the same as the Senate bill.

Part B—Institutes in guidance and counseling

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for the establishment of institutes in guidance and counseling, although in somewhat different language. The differences of substance between the two versions are as follows:

(1) The House bill authorized the appropriation of \$6,000,000 for fiscal 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, while the Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of \$6,250,000 for fiscal 1959, and \$7,250,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

(2) The House bill, unlike the Senate amendment, contained a provision providing that the institutes would place emphasis upon the counseling and guidance of gifted students.

(3) Under the House bill a person employed by a public school system who is engaged in guidance and counseling on a full or part-time basis would receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week, plus \$15 a week for each dependent, except that no one would receive more than his last rate of salary during the preceding academic year. The Senate amendment provided for payments of stipends and allowances for dependents to personnel and teachers engaged in, or preparing to engage in, counseling and guidance in public secondary schools, but no maximum permissible amount was provided for such stipends and allowances.

The conference substitute adopts the language of the Senate amendment, except that the provisions of the House bill limiting the amount of stipends to \$75 a week and of dependents' allowances to \$15 per dependent per week are included in the substitute.

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

The House bill and Senate amendment both authorized the Commissioner to contract for the operation by institutions of higher education during fiscal 1959 through fiscal 1962 of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers of any modern foreign language in schools at the elementary or secondary level. No specific authorization of appropriations is provided for such institutes in the House bill, but for carrying out all of title IV of the House bill (relating to language development), section 404 authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed \$4,500,000 for each of the four fiscal years of the program. The Senate amendment for each of the four fiscal years of the program authorizes the appropriation of \$7,250,000 for such institutes.

Both versions would also provide for the payment of stipends and dependents' allowances to persons attending the institutes. The House bill also provided for travel to and from their places of residence of individuals attending such institutes and their dependents. The Senate version has no similar provision.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the Senate version, except that it provides that a person attending a language institute shall be eligible (after application) therefor to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such person with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend of \$15 per week for each such dependent.

The House bill and the Senate amendment both provided for language and area centers and for research and studies in language instruction. The conference substitute is the same as the House bill, except that the appropriation of \$8,000,000 is authorized, instead of \$4,500,000, as provided in the House bill for all language development.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

The House bill authorized an appropriation of \$2 million a year for 4 years to enable the Commissioner of Education, through grants or contracts, to undertake functions detailed in paragraphs (1) through (5) of section 701 of the House bill, to enable him to provide (upon request) advice, counsel, and technical assistance to State or local educational agencies or institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize television, radio, motion pictures, and related communications media in providing education.

The Senate amendment authorized an appropriation of \$5 million for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1959, and \$10 million for each of the three succeeding years to carry out research and experimentation (directly or through grant or contract) with respect to adaptation and utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related communications media for educational purposes and to disseminate information with respect to new educational media.

The Senate amendment also established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, and permitted the Commissioner of Education to secure (without regard to the civil-service laws) the assistance and advice of persons who are expert in the adaptation and utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and other related media of communication for educational purposes.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that (1) it would authorize the appropriation of \$3 million for fiscal 1959 and \$5 million for each of the next three fiscal years, and (2) it permits the Commissioner to carry out research and experimentation only through grants and contracts.

TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The Senate amendment included a title relating to area vocational programs which had no counterpart in the House bill. This title was designed to provide assistance to the States so that they could improve and expand their vocational education programs through area vocational education programs; approved by State boards as providing vocational and related technical training and retraining for youths, adults, and older persons, including related instruction for apprentices, designed to fit them for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in scientific and technical fields.

The title amends the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (the George-Barden Act) by adding the following new title:

TITLE III—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Section 301—Authorization of appropriations
This section authorizes appropriation of \$20 million for fiscal 1959 and each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

Section 302—Allotments to States

The amounts appropriated are to be allotted to the States in the same ratio as the total amounts allotted under title I of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, the Act of March 18, 1950, and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956.

The amounts allotted to a State, but not required by it (according to its certification), would be available for reallocation to other States.

Section 303—Payments to States

The payments shall be made on the condition that the State will match the grants on a 50-50 basis and that the amounts granted will not be used to reduce State or local funds used for vocational education programs under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts, although State and local funds under those laws in excess of what is needed for 50-50 matching could be used to match the new Federal funds.

This section provides payments to the States on the basis of estimates, with necessary adjustments for overpayments or underpayments in previous periods, on a quarterly basis or any other period prescribed by the Commissioner. The payments could be made in installments determined by the Commissioner.

The section also provides that funds appropriated for this program will be used exclusively for training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians or semiprofessional personnel in recognized occupations requiring

scientific knowledge in fields necessary for the national defense.

Section 304—Use of funds

Amounts allotted under this title could be used for administration, supervision, and teacher-training expenses; for salaries and travel expenses for school personnel; for travel expenses for advisory committees; for purchase and rental of instructional equipment (and maintenance and repair thereof) and purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids; for transportation of students; for securing necessary educational information for development of programs; for training and work experience for out-of-school youth; for related instruction for apprentices; and for determining the need for and planning of the programs.

Any equipment obtained by the use of the allotted funds would become State property.

Section 305—Additional State plan requirements

In order for a State to qualify for assistance under this title, its State plan must be amended to—

(1) designate the State board as the sole agency for the plan's administration or provide for the supervision of its administration by State or local educational agencies;

(2) set up minimum qualifications for persons having responsibilities under the plan;

(3) outline specific plans, policies and methods for carrying out the State plan;

(4) provide for proper accounting and budgeting methods and provide for the making of necessary reports to the Commissioner.

Any plan meeting these requirements would be approved by the Commissioner.

If the Commissioner subsequently finds the State has failed to comply substantially with the above requirements in administration of the plan or because of a change in State plan, he shall, upon notifying the State board, stop further payments or limit such payments to parts of the plan not affected by such failure until such time as the State has complied with the requirements. Such action may only be taken after notice and opportunity for hearing has been accorded the State board.

The State may appeal the Commissioner's decision to the United States court of appeals. The summons and the notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact of the Commissioner are conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of evidence; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner for further evidence to be taken. The court would have jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the decision in whole or in part. The judgment of the court of appeals would be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Section 306—Appropriations for administration

This section authorizes the inclusion in the appropriations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of such sums as shall be necessary to administer this new title of the George-Barden Act.

Section 307—Definitions

This section provides definitions of the terms listed below to be used for the purposes of the new title.

(1) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and Guam.

(2) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(3) The terms "State plan" and "State board" have the same meaning which said terms have in the act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114).

(4) The term "area vocational education program" means a program consisting of one or more less-than-college grade courses con-

ducted under public supervision and control and on an organized, systematic class basis, which is designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in recognized occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge, and which is made available to residents of the State or an area thereof designated and approved by the State board, who either have completed junior high school or, regardless of their school credits, are at least 16 years of age and can reasonably be expected to profit by the instruction offered.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that (1) the appropriations authorized are reduced to \$15,000,000 a year, and (2) the provision in the Senate amendment limiting the types of training for which the funds may be used is modified to delete the reference therein to "semiprofessional personnel" and to give the State boards of vocational education the function of determining what are "recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge."

Courses in public colleges or public junior colleges, which are not offered toward a baccalaureate degree and meet other criteria of "less-than-college-grade" courses, could be included by the State Board under this program just as they are today under the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts.

TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

Under this provision of the Senate amendment the National Science Foundation would be required to establish a Science Information Service. The Foundation, through the Service, would provide for indexing, abstracting, translating and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information. It would also undertake to develop improved methods for making scientific information available.

The Senate amendment provided for the establishment of a Science Information Council by the National Science Foundation within the Foundation to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to, the head of the Science Information Service. The Council would consist of the Librarian of Congress, the Director of the National Library of Medicine, the Director of the Department of Agriculture Library, and the Head of the Science Information Service, as ex officio members. Fifteen additional members would be appointed by the Director of the National Science Foundation. Six of the appointed members would be experts in the fields of science, six leaders in librarianship and scientific documentation; and three representatives of the lay public interested in the fields of communication. The appointments are for a term of 4 years, except that in order to provide for staggered terms, 4 of the members first appointed will serve for a term of 3 years, 4 for a term of 2 years, and 3 for a term of 1 year. If a member is appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term, the appointment shall be only for the remainder of such term. No member may be reappointed until after 1 year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term. The Council is to meet at least twice a year or more often if necessary.

The National Science Foundation would have the same power and authority under this title that it has under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. Under the Senate amendment, all the grants under the title were required to be approved by the National Science Board.

The title authorized the appropriation, starting with the fiscal year which ends June 30, 1959, of such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the title.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts this Senate provision with the single exception that the provision which required grants to be approved by the Na-

tional Science Board was deleted as unnecessary in light of certain recent enactments.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

The Senate amendment authorized the delegation by the Commissioner to any officer or employee of the Office of Education of any of his functions under this act, other than the making of regulations. The conference substitute accepts this provision.

Under the Senate amendment no one could receive a grant or loan from funds made available under the act until he executes and files a noncommunist affidavit and has taken an oath of allegiance to the United States. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment.

The substitute adopted by the conferees does not include provisions which were in the House bill authorizing the Commissioner to accept gifts, grants, bequests, or devises for carrying out the provisions of the act. There were no comparable provisions in the Senate amendment.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
CARL ELLIOTT,
LEE METCALF,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
H. G. HASKELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 22, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2254. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Canal Zone Government for the period July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2255. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands"; to the Committee on Armed Forces.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 12899. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, and to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the financing, construction, and operation of additional works for joint use with the State of California, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7035. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions of judg-

ment debtors, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2683). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 13760. A bill to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement; with amendment (Rept. No. 2684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 10614. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the State of Florida to Sumter County, Fla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 13450. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2686). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee of conference. S. 1411. An act to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security (Rept. No. 2687). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee of conference. H. R. 13247. A bill to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2688). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 13836. A bill to authorize an adjustment in the repayment obligation of the Pine River Irrigation District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 13837. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper unit of the Yampa-White project as a participating project of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 13838. A bill to provide that certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Nevada shall be held in trust for members of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 13839. A bill to establish an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Water Pollution Control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 13840. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HASKELL:

H. R. 13841. A bill to prohibit convicted felons from holding union office or employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 13842. A bill to prohibit eavesdropping under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 13843. A bill to authorize the payment of supplemental unemployment compensation to unemployed persons attending

elimination of the Senate limitation of 300 rural redevelopment counties, of the appointment of local redevelopment committees, and of the specific employment of private firms for technical assistance; and (e) minor changes in the urban renewal part of the program."

13. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Proxmire stated that the April 1 reduction in dairy price supports cost Wis. dairymen \$8 $\frac{1}{2}$ million in the past 4 months, and that at the same time consumers had not benefited, and alleged that the Administration's policies were aiding only the middleman. He inserted a table showing the increase in USDA expenditures since 1953, and quoted from a 1952 speech by the President as a basis for contending that the Secretary was following a contrary policy. pp. 17534-6
Sen. Martin, Iowa, spoke on "Fifty Facts For Farmers," citing various statistics and information to show that trends in agriculture were favorable. pp. 17614-6
14. EDUCATION. Agreed, 66 to 15, to the conference report on H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill. pp. 17577-87
Sen. Neuberger inserted an article on the national defense education bill, H. R. 13247. p. 17753
15. PUBLIC DEBT. Passed as reported, 57 to 20, H. R. 13580, to increase the public debt limit to \$288 billion through fiscal year 1959, and \$283 billion thereafter. pp. 17629-30, 17725, 17729-49, 17753-4
16. PERSONNEL. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 1903, to provide that Presidential appointees who serve specific terms of more than 2 years overseas shall be entitled to travel expenses, the same as other Federal employees, when they return to their place of residence at the end of their tour of duty. p. 17590
Sen. Allott commended Federal employees who "under handicaps of more work with fewer people, are doing so well in the field of public service," and cited the Federal Housing Administration office in Colo. as an example. p. 17540
17. FOREIGN AID. Senate began debate on H. R. 13192, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1959. The committee amendments were adopted. pp. 17747-50
Sen. Watkins submitted an amendment to be proposed to H.R. 13192, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1959, to add \$2.5 million to the bill and allow the President to use such funds to alleviate economic hardships overseas caused by the application of the application of the escape clause provision of the Trade Agreements Act. p. 17515
18. SURPLUS COMMODITIES; FOREIGN TRADE. Sens. Schoepfel urged enactment of legislation to extend Public Law 480 so as to aid in sales of surplus farm commodities. pp. 17529-30
19. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 13856, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1959 (S. Rept. 2495). p. 17754
Sens. Bridges and Williams submitted an amendment to be proposed to H. R. 13856, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1959, to request the President to reduce expenditures 2% on defense items, and 4 to 10% on other appropriations (except for fixed cost items such as interest, pensions, Federal-State cooperative benefits, or veterans compensation), with a report on actions taken on such review to be included in the 1960 budget. p. 17754
20. CONTRACTS. Passed as reported H.R. 11749, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months. Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 17558, 17596-9

21. VIRGIN ISLANDS. Adopted the conference report on H. R. 12226, to extend until June 30, 1959, the charter of the Virgin Islands Corporation, including new authority to operate salt water distillation facilities and continuation of authority for sugar production. p. 17600
22. FRUITS. Sen. Langer inserted an article on a proposed chokecherry preserve industry in N. D. pp. 17752-3

SENATE - August 23

23. MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959. Both Houses received and agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 13192 (H. Rept. 2704). The Senate had passed the bill earlier as reported by the Appropriations Committee. pp. 17787-88, 17826-48, 17850-62, 17955-6, 17974-8, 17991-2, 18897-98 This bill will now be sent to the President.
24. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 13856. (pp. 17865-76) Rejected, 30 to 45, an amendment by Sen. Williams for himself and several others, which would have requested the President to review expenditures programmed by the Federal agencies during 1959, and to reduce expenditures 2 percent on defense items, and 4 to 10 percent on expenditures of other agencies (except for certain fixed cost items), and to report on actions taken on such a review to be included in the 1960 budget. (pp. 17868-74) The House concurred in the Senate amendments with an amendment of its own. (p. 17965) The Senate then concurred in the House amendment. (pp. 17994-7) This bill will now be sent to the President.

Received from the President a supplemental appropriation request for the Departments of Labor and Treasury (S. Doc. 119). p. 17758

25. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment H. R. 12281, to authorize the Secretary of Interior to exchange lands to provide for an administrative site in the El Portal area of the Yosemite National Park, including the exchange of National Forest land. (p. 17790) This bill will now be sent to the President.
- Sen. Morse inserted a series of resolutions adopted by the Ore. State Labor Council relating to forestry, timber, forest disease, water power, etc. (pp. 17776-8
26. BUTTER; CHEESE. Agreed to the House amendments to S. 2006, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to relieve the Surgeon General of the Army and Navy from sitting with the Secretary of Agriculture on appeals boards to decide appeals from the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury on cases involving deleterious substances in butter or oleomargarine or in any substance in the manufacture of so-called filled cheese. (pp. 17786-7) This bill will now be sent to the President.
27. SCHOOL LUNCHES. Agreed to the House amendment to S. 1764, to authorize payment of the cost of free lunches for needy children in the D. C. public schools. (p. 17787) This bill will now be sent to the President.
28. FOOD ADDITIVES. Passed with amendments H. R. 13254, to prohibit the use of food additives until after adequate tests of their safety have been determined. Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Williams to exempt from the bill those products regulated under the Poultry Products Inspection Act. The House concurred in the Senate amendment to the bill. (pp. 17791-2, 17938) This bill will now be sent to the President.

at a price which will appeal to the consumer.

It is necessary to experiment with a batch of berries in order to find out if this is possible, and if present plans are carried out, the company will need an experimental batch of 2,000 gallons. If the juice is high enough, additional purchases will probably run as high as 10,000 gallons.

Success of the experiment can very well turn out to be a big item in the future economy of the region, Patrick Gourneau, chairman of the Turtle Mountain advisory committee, said.

Should the experimental batch come through with flying colors, there is every reason to believe that a steady market for the berries in the future is assured, Gourneau stated.

Two chokecherry receiving stations have been established in the area, one in Belcourt, the other in Dunseith. The company is paying 25 cents a gallon for the batch of experimental berries. If the venture is a success, there will very likely be an increase in the price next year, Gourneau said.

To insure the maximum return of juice per gallon to the company, the berries must be picked at the proper stage of ripeness. Dobervich was in the area to instruct the people when they should start picking.

Berries must also be picked clean and taken to market in the shortest possible time, and when it is necessary to hold berries over a day, they must be stored in a cool place.

To accommodate pickers, the receiving stations have designated 3 days of each week as purchasing days, and 4-gallon capacity picking containers are furnished free by the company and are available at the receiving stations.

People without land wishing to pick berries should get permission of the landowner before commencing the chore, Gourneau advised.

That the Turtle Mountain region is "loaded" with the fruit was proved last weekend when the Julius Peltier family of Dunseith picked 24 cans or 96 gallons.

In summing up the idea behind the venture, Gourneau said, "The berries bought here will be transported to Fargo. There they will be put through a pitting machine and the juice extracted. The juice in turn will be converted into jams and jellies and placed on the market. The company is confident that a waiting market can be found. The whole question hinges on the amount of juice a gallon of berries will produce. If results are satisfactory, we are in business every summer. If results are unsatisfactory, we can still chalk up the venture as a noble experiment.

"Again, if results are satisfactory, we can look forward to a bright future for native fruit. We have other fruit besides chokecherries. Experiments are also planned this year for cranberries and plums. If everything turns out well and we come to realize that native fruit is a resource worth preserving, we will surely lose the urge to set fires each spring which are so destructive not only to native wild fruit, but to wildlife as well."

FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIP AND LOAN BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, because the Senate has today approved the conference report on the Federal scholarship and loan bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a thoughtful article by A. Robert Smith in the Pendleton East-Oregonian of August 15, 1958, which describes some of the benefits that will accrue to educational institutions in the State of Oregon under this legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION IS ASSURED

(By Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Oregon's State and private institutions of higher learning would be eligible for about \$500,000 to \$700,000 annually in Federal funds to offer students in the form of loans, under legislation which passed the House last week and is pending in the Senate, Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, Oregon, said she was informed.

The House and Senate bills are similar in most respects, except that the House ruled out giving scholarships to needy students and put the scholarship funds into the bill's student loan provisions.

Oregon colleges and universities would administer the loan funds pretty much as they see fit, determining who qualifies, as long as the students are needy and do satisfactory work. Each institution would be able to receive no more than \$250,000 each year from the Government for loans. The institution itself would be required to provide matching funds so that the total loan fund would contain no more than 75 percent Federal funds, no less than 25 percent local funds.

The student who borrows money from the loan fund could obtain no more than \$1,000 each year no more than \$5,000 for all his years in school. He would be required to repay the loan over a period of 11 years following graduation. While in school he would pay interest on the loan at 2 percent but need not pay any principle during that period. Following graduation, there would be a year of grace. Then for the next 10 years, the rate of interest would be 4 percent.

Each State's allotment under the amount authorized by the bill would be determined by the United States Office of Education by comparing the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher learning in the State compared to the number enrolled nationally.

The Senate version contains \$40 million for this program the first year, which would give Oregon about \$489,000 that year. The House, by lumping scholarship funds into the loan program, increased this first year figure to \$47.5 million.

Then for the next 3 years, the Senate version calls for \$60 million annually for loans. Oregon's share each year would be about \$600,000 of that amount. But the House has increased the second-year figure to \$75 million, of which Oregon would get close to \$700,000, the Office of Education told Congresswoman GREEN.

The Senate is expected to pass the bill and retain the scholarship grants for needy students, which will throw the bill into a conference for some sort of compromise. The House knocked the scholarship authorization out by a standing vote, 109 to 78, on a motion by Representative WALTER JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota.

The Senate bill provides for \$17.5 million in scholarships annually for 4 years. Needy students could obtain up to \$500 annually in these grants, and the institution the student is attending could add up to \$500 annually in addition to each student's scholarship.

The House-passed bill also contains authorization for 1,000 fellowships of \$2,000 each to train college teachers; \$60 million in grants to States for scientific teaching equipment, of which Oregon would be eligible for \$619,000 a year; \$15 million in grants to improve testing and guidance programs; \$6 million for teacher-training institutes in the guidance field, among other things.

Mrs. GREEN, who was on the House Education Committee that drafted the bill, op-

posed deletion of the scholarship program but felt the resulting measure is a very good bill. It represented real progress, because this is the first time the House has ever passed a general education bill.

She said she thought the scholarship program was important because it would be a congressional indication of the value we place on educational achievement. The scholarship would serve as sort of a prize. It would get students to work just a little bit harder. The scholarship is recognition of scholastic achievement. A loan is just recognition of financial need.

Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, took the other position—that loans were more desirable than scholarships.

"I don't regard the prize aspect as very strong," said PORTER. "The student ought to be glad to get a loan. It's an investment in his future. After getting a degree, he will probably have a better job and be able to repay it. And this will mean that the money can then be used by someone else. It will also save the Government a lot of money."

When the Federal aid to education bill comes up in the Senate, an attempt may be made to add an amendment providing for a public school construction program. But Mrs. GREEN said, regretfully, that such a proposal would not gain House approval at this time, hence could not become law.

The Eisenhower administration has made no request for a school construction program this year. The administration has asked for a scholarship program, but of less than half the proportions provided by the Senate bill.

While details remain to be worked out between the two versions emerging from either Chamber, it appears almost certain that Federal aid will this year be launched for the benefit of college students and teachers, if not for teachers and buildings in the elementary and secondary school field of education.

INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate much longer, but there seems to be some misapprehension about the reason for the deficit of \$15 billion in fiscal 1958-59, and the second request by the administration for an increase in the debt limit.

If the hearings before the Committee on Finance are read, it will be found that I questioned the Secretary of the Treasury very closely on the reason for the deficit. These are the facts. The deficit of approximately \$3 billion for 1957-58 is due entirely to the failure of revenues to come up to expectations. There was a decline of \$3 billion in revenue below the amount which was budgeted in January. The Secretary of the Treasury, upon being questioned, admitted that the fall in revenues was due to the recession. So the recession caused the deficit of \$3 billion for the current year.

Five billion dollars of the projected deficit of \$12 billion for the fiscal year 1958-59 is due to an increase in expenditures above the amount contemplated in the budget. But \$7 billion of the projected deficit is due to the belief that revenues will fall below expectations; that the revenues will amount to \$67 billion instead of \$74 billion, as budgeted.

This means that of the deficit of \$15 billion, \$10 billion will be due to a fall in revenues, not to an increase in expenditures. The Secretary of the Treasury admitted that this fall in revenue was

due to the recession. In other words, it is the recession which has primarily caused the deficit, which in turn has forced the Government to increase the debt limit.

I think that is very important to realize, because all the talk a few minutes ago was to the effect that it was an increase in expenditures which had caused the increase in the debt limit.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think that what the Senator from Illinois has said about the loss of revenue being caused by the recession is true. However, is it not also true that some of the fiscal policies which have been followed by the Government have not been conducive to creating a strong economy?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree.

Mr. MORSE. In the reasons which I gave, I tried to point out the kind of wasteful policy which has been followed in connection with some of the foreign-aid programs, and the wasteful policy which has been followed in connection with some of the tax loopholes which have accrued to the benefit of some of the vested interests in this country, which have not taken the tax savings and plowed them back into industry at all, but have frozen them and have stopped working them. This, in turn, has had a bad effect on the economy, and has produced less revenue for the economy, and has thus created, in part, the deficit.

Therefore, those who have been fighting for wealth-creating projects and fighting for the abolition of certain types of wasteful military expenditures, have tried to make a fight to strengthen the producing features of our economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Dickinson Dam in the State of North Dakota as "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake" (Rept. No. 2494).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H. R. 13856. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2495).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 4129. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (Rept. No. 2496).

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

The following additional bills were introduced:

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 4323. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; read the first time by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 4324. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Winnemucca Colony, Humboldt County, Nev., and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 4325. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces commemorating the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park; read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of Rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 13856), an act making appropriations for sundry executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely, at the end of the bill, add the following new section:

"SEC. —. The Congress hereby requests the President, from time to time during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to review the expenditures programed by the executive branch for such fiscal year and to issue such directives to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and other officials in the executive branch of the Government as may be necessary to achieve the maximum reduction in the expenditures of the executive branch during such fiscal year consistent with the objectives of maintaining essential Government services, providing adequately for the common defense, and fostering a healthy national economy; all with a view toward achieving an aggregate, of at least 2 percent on defense appropriations and at least 4 percent on other appropriations but not more than 10 percent on any one item, reduction in the expenditures programed by the executive branch as of July 1, 1958, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to authorize executive action to decrease expenditures for interest on the public debt, veterans compensation, or pensions, Federal, and State cooperative benefit programs and expenditures from trust funds. A report of action taken under this chapter shall be contained in the 1960 budget."

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS) also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 13856, making

appropriations for sundry executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

APPOINTMENTS TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE HISTORIC SENATE DOCUMENTS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment by him, pursuant to Senate Resolution 318 of this Congress, of the following Senators to the special committee to study the feasibility and desirability of preserving selected documents, records, and memorabilia of the United States Senate having historical significance or value:

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah.

Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, of Georgia.

ADDITIONAL APPENDIX MATTERS

By Mr. BEALL:

Statement prepared by himself regarding the 1958 Multiple Sclerosis Hope Chest.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Editorial entitled "Judges Caution Judges," published in the Washington Daily News of August 22, 1958.

Article entitled "The Supreme Court Is Rebuked," written by David Lawrence; and editorial entitled "Supreme Court Critics," both published in the Washington Evening Star of August 22, 1958.

By Mr. COOPER:

Editorial entitled "Aid to Education," published in the Sheboygan, Wis., Press of August 18, 1958.

By Mr. GORE:

Letter written by him to Tom J. Hitch, president of the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 22, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 607) to provide retirement, clerical assistance, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Saturday, August 23, 1958, at 10 o'clock a. m.

present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—71		
Aiken	Hennings	Murray
Anderson	Hill	Neuberger
Barrett	Hoblitzell	O'Mahoney
Beall	Humphrey	Pastore
Bible	Jackson	Potter
Bridges	Javits	Proxmire
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Portell
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Case, N. J.	Jordan	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Church	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Langer	Sparkman
Cotton	Long	Stennis
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Dworshak	Malone	Talmadge
Eastland	Mansfield	Thye
Ervin	McClellan	Watkins
Fulbright	McNamara	Wiley
Goldwater	Monroney	Williams
Gore	Morse	Yarborough
Green	Morton	Young
Hayden	Mundt	

NAYS—12		
Allott	Dirksen	Lausche
Bennett	Ellender	Martin, Iowa
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Curtis	Knowland	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—13		
Bricker	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Butler	Holland	Payne
Capehart	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Ives	
Flanders	Jenner	

So the bill (H. R. 12728) was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Oregon to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3712) to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1864. An act to authorize an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; to provide increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office; and for other purposes;

S. 3335. An act to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed,

with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3379. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 3942. An act for the relief of certain aliens distressed as the result of natural calamity in the Azores Islands, and for other purposes; and

S. 4039. An act to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 21, 1958, pp. 17500-17508, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the conference report was signed by all the Senate conferees. With the exception of the scholarship provision, the bill is substantially the same as the bill which passed the Senate. The scholarship provision went out of the bill entirely.

The House had previously stricken the scholarship provision from the bill. When the provision was before the Senate, as we know, the provision as written into the bill by the Senate committee was very seriously changed by the Cooper amendment. The bargaining power of the Senate conferees was stripped. Therefore, without bargaining power and with the scholarship provision seriously damaged, the result was that the scholarship provision went out of the bill.

The loan provision provides that a student may receive a loan on the basis of ability and need, not to exceed \$1,000. Over a period of time the student cannot borrow more than \$5,000. The loan would be repaid over a 10-year period, beginning 1 year after the borrower left college, with an interest rate of 3 percent. Up to 50 percent of the loan could be forgiven if the borrower should teach in a public elementary or secondary school. The forgiveness feature would operate at 10 percent a year until 50 percent of the loan had been forgiven.

The language of the statute sets forth clearly the requirements which must be met before a student will be eligible for a loan, in these words:

Such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate or graduate student;

In other words, the loans shall go only to eligible students in institutions who are in need thereof. In the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund, special consideration will be given to (a) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools and (b) students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language.

The other provisions of the bill are substantially the same as those of the bill passed by the Senate.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE PURCHASE OF SCIENCE TEACHING EQUIPMENT

The conference report would authorize \$70 million, first, for making grants to State educational agencies for the purpose of acquiring laboratories and other special equipment, including audio-visual materials and equipment and printed materials, other than textbooks, suitable for use in public elementary and secondary schools to provide education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language; and, second, for making loans to nonprofit elementary or secondary schools for the purchase of science teaching equipment.

Grants made to the States would be required to be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis. Twelve percent of the appropriation would be reserved for making the above-mentioned loans to provide nonprofit elementary or secondary schools. These loans would be repaid over a period of up to 10 years. Five million dollars is authorized to be used for administration and for the expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in public elementary and secondary schools in the fields of science, mathematics, or modern foreign language.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

The conference report would authorize 1,000 fellowships the first year and 1,500 for each of the succeeding years for graduate students who are interested in teaching at the college or university level.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING AND TESTING

The conference report authorizes \$15 million a year for 4 years for making grants to State educational agencies, with matching by the States on a dollar-for-dollar basis after the first year, for a program directed at identifying outstanding students, advising them con-

cerning courses, and encouraging them to attend college.

Six million dollars would be authorized for institutes for the training of guidance and counseling personnel.

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

The conference report authorizes the Commissioner to contract with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them of centers for instruction in languages now rarely taught in the United States and for instruction in other fields to provide a full understanding of the areas in which such languages are commonly spoken.

The conference report authorizes foreign language institutes for advanced training, for individuals engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training of teachers, of any modern foreign language in elementary schools. Seven million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars would be authorized for each of the 4 years of this program.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

The conference report authorizes the appropriation of \$3 million for fiscal 1959 and \$5 million for each of the 3 succeeding years to enable the Commissioner to conduct, assist, and foster research and experimentation in the development and evaluation of projects involving new media of communication which proves of value to education at all levels.

TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The conference report amends the George-Barden Act by adding a new title III to it. Under this new title, \$15 million is authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year to allow States and local areas to conduct less-than-college-grade courses designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technicians and skilled workers in occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge.

TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

The conference report would direct the National Science Foundation to establish a Science Information Service. The Service will be responsible for providing for indexing, abstracting, translating, and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information. The Science Information Service would also undertake programs to develop new or improved methods, including mechanized systems, for making scientific information available.

The Senate bill authorized the appointment of a number of additional supergrade positions in the Office of Education. Both House and Senate conferees agreed that such positions should be authorized to enable the Commissioner of Education to hire highly competent men to administer the new programs authorized by this legislation. However, because of the parliamentary situation it was decided to leave this provision out of the conference report. This should not be taken to mean that the conferees believed that such additional positions will not be necessary.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that I may be permitted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who at the present time is the ranking minority member of the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to say on the floor of the Senate what a great job I think the chairman of the committee did in the conference committee. We had three long, hard days of conference in an effort to reconcile not only differences between the House and Senate, but also differences among the House Members themselves, and differences among the Senate conferees. I believe that a great result has been accomplished.

What has happened, really, is a change in emphasis. The emphasis of the bill has shifted. We had thought that through the scholarships we could provide a real impetus to tougher and better curriculums, and better scholarship in our primary and secondary schools. In the bill as agreed to by the conferees, I think the emphasis has shifted a little more toward helping to produce better teachers, better schools, and better courses. I am not sure that in the long run emphasis on the other features may not be just as important.

I wished to pay my respects to the Senator from Alabama, who, during the 3 days of the conference, did a marvelous job. I believe we succeeded in retaining as much of the best part of the bill as we could possibly keep.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Alabama worked as teammates on the bill. We started as teammates on the very first day of the hearing. We spent many days in the hearings, and many days considering the bill in committee. Then we worked together closely on the floor. In the conferences committee the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Alabama worked together. If any credit is due, the Senator from Colorado certainly shares in such credit.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. What is the difference in total cost, as between the conference recommendation and the Senate bill?

Mr. HILL. Before I try to give a specific answer, let me say that this bill is a 4-year bill, but it has certain so-called "phasing-out" periods. Under the provisions of the bill embodied in the conference report, a young man may receive a loan the third year of the bill, to go on to college. If he receives it the third year of the bill, he will have a right to go beyond the fourth year, which is the basic period of the bill, in order that he may finish his college course. But without getting into the "phasing-out" period, I should say that the bill as originally passed by the Senate involved a cost for the 4-year period of \$1,101,090,000. The bill embodied in the conference report involves a total

cost of \$887,090,000. In other words, the cost of the bill embodied in the conference report is at least \$214 million less than the cost of the bill passed by the Senate.

However, there is one point I wish to emphasize, so that every Senator will know it. There is the so-called "phasing-out" period, and it is not possible to know what the phasing-out may cost.

There is another point which I wish to emphasize. So far the loans are calculated as a part of the cost; yet, the transactions being loans, we expect most of the money to be paid back, with 3 percent interest.

Mr. WATKINS. If they were all paid back, what would be the cost?

Mr. HILL. The loans for the 4-year period amount to \$295 million. However, as I stated, a student, in the illustration which I use, who received his loan in the third year would be entitled to get his loan the fourth year of the bill, and he would be entitled to continue and finish his course. So in addition to the \$295 million, some additional loan funds will be used. However, the purpose of the bill is that the loans shall be paid back unless the borrower should engage in teaching in a public secondary or elementary school. In that case up to 50 percent of the loan would be forgiven.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator mentioned the fact that there had been a shift in emphasis. What was that shift?

Mr. HILL. I believe that what our distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] had in mind—and he can speak better for himself than I can—was the shift from scholarships to loans. In the bill which we brought to the floor of the Senate we were seeking to challenge the youth of America, the boys and girls in our secondary and elementary schools, by offering an award or prize of a scholarship. This was not only to challenge the boys and girls, but to challenge the parents, the idea being that if we challenged the parents, they would not only encourage and stimulate their boys and girls, but would also do all they could to make sure that the schools to which their children went were a little better, and to provide more of the difficult courses in science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

There would also be a challenge to the school officials, who would want to see the graduates of their schools win as many awards and prizes as possible.

Mr. WATKINS. Would the help given under the terms of the bill be largely in the field of science and mathematics?

Mr. HILL. We provide an incentive for students who have the proper academic background. Let me read the Senator the exact language from section 204 (4) of the bill:

Under this section the agreement with the institution of higher education would:

(4) provide that in the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund special consideration shall be given to (A) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (B) students whose academic back-

ground indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language.

Such students would receive special consideration. There might be more applicants than could be provided with loans. If there were not enough money to take care of all the applicants, those in the categories to which I have referred would receive special consideration.

Mr. WATKINS. I voted against the bill when it was before the Senate, but I believe that striking out the grants for scholarships probably has improved it. The Senator may not agree with that view. I believe, on the whole, that the emphasis is in the right place, on loans, and providing more and better teachers for science, mathematics, and the languages. I believe I could now vote for the bill.

Mr. HILL. Notwithstanding the great esteem in which I hold the Senator from Utah, I must say that I strongly and emphatically disagree with his opinion. I believe that the bill would be better if it had a strong scholarship provision such as was in the bill reported by the Senate committee.

The Senator from Utah asked a question to which the Senator from Colorado had previously addressed himself. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding to me. I had previously commented on this subject.

With the striking of the scholarship feature, it has been found that the emphasis of the bill has shifted.

The emphasis which is left is highly desirable, and I believe most Senators will find this a very desirable bill.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Alabama will recall that when the bill was before the Senate we had a colloquy as to whether junior colleges would be able to receive funds under title IV for laboratory equipment and things of that kind. The House had such a provision in its bill. It is my understanding that the conferees accepted that House provision. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator's understanding is correct. The bill provides:

For purposes of sections 301 through 304, the term "secondary school" may include a public junior college as determined under State law.

I believe that is what the Senator from Michigan had in mind. I am very happy to say to him that that provision is in the bill.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to thank the Senator, because that provision will be of great benefit to States like Michigan. If the Senator would indulge me for one more minute, I should like to make a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent to have included in the record statements by me and others concerning industry's support of higher education, and I ask that the statements appear following the vote on the conference report.

Mr. HILL. I make the same request, that the material appear following the vote on the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Under the provisions of the bill, how can a student borrow money?

Mr. HILL. He can borrow up to \$1,000 a year.

Mr. LANGER. What are the mechanics involved? To whom does he apply?

Mr. HILL. He first must be admitted to an institution of higher education. He first must be admitted. When he is admitted to the institution, he makes application for a loan.

Mr. LANGER. Must he sign a note?

Mr. HILL. Of course, he promises to pay back the loan. He does not have to get an endorser, unless under the applicable State law his signature would not create a binding obligation, if that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. LANGER. He can get a loan of \$1,000. That would be \$4,000 in 4 years. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. Under the bill, if he takes a course which requires 5 years—some courses, such as engineering require another year—he can get \$1,000 for that fifth year also. He can borrow up to \$1,000 a year, based on his need, but not more than a total of \$5,000.

Mr. LANGER. If the student applying is a minor, does anyone have to sign a note for him?

Mr. HILL. No; he signs his own note and may not be required to secure an endorser or to provide security unless he is a minor and his signature would not, under applicable State law, create a binding obligation.

Mr. LANGER. When must the note be repaid?

Mr. HILL. It is repaid over a 10-year period after he leaves college.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I, too, join with other Members of the Senate in recognition of the patient work of the distinguished Senator from Alabama in bringing the bill to final passage in the Senate. I voted to report the bill from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I voted for it on passage in the Senate. Of course I shall vote for the conference report.

My purpose in rising is to direct attention to a statement which the distinguished Senator from Alabama made in his presentation of the conference report, and a statement which is attributed to him by the New York Times today. The

statement attributed to the Senator is this: "The Cooper amendment on the floor of the Senate seriously damaged the scholarship bill and stripped the Senate conferees of their bargaining power with the House conferees."

I was not a member of the conference committee, and therefore I am not able to speak of the conference deliberation. However, having read the House debate at the time of the passage of the House bill, and having noted the firm position the House took, I differ with my distinguished friend. I doubt very much that there was any intention upon the part of the House or on the part of its conferees to accept any scholarship provisions.

If the House conferees were not willing to accept the amendment which I had offered in the Senate, and which had been accepted by the Senate, providing for scholarship grants of \$250 a year, or a total of \$1,000 in 4 years, plus—and I emphasize the plus because it always seems to be left out—plus the additional loan of \$750 a year, or a total of \$3,000 for 4 years, an amendment which would cost the Government between \$80 million and \$200 million less than the Senate committee version, I doubt very much that the House conferees would have accepted the more grandiose scholarship provisions of the Senate committee—which the Senator favored.

I do not wish to go over old ground, but there has been some discussion of this subject, and I will take a minute or two to discuss the matter.

When the House considered the education bill, it struck out the scholarship title entirely. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had the matter before it. There was a very thorough discussion of the scholarship title. My position has been consistent. I offered an amendment in committee that the fellowship section should be on a basis of 50 percent grants, and 50 percent loans. The committee unanimously accepted the amendment. I also offered an amendment in committee providing that the scholarship title, title II, should be based on 50 percent grants, and 50 percent loans. That was not accepted by the committee. Then, on the floor of the Senate I offered an amendment which provided \$250 in grants a year and \$750 in loans, which would make available \$1,000 a year to a student receiving a scholarship award. The Senate accepted my amendment.

I should like to tell the Senate why I offered the amendment because I did not go into detail, on the floor of the Senate on the evening when the Senate considered the bill. I offered it, first, because I believe the inclusion of loans is more in conformity with the American tradition than a system of outright grants, up to \$1,000. I believe it just that funds and the opportunity for education should be available for the deserving and, I might say, needier applicants, and that preference and emphasis should be in that direction, rather than in one which would provide thousand-dollar grants without regard to need.

I had other reasons. I believe the bill was loose in its scholarship provisions.

There were no clear standards established for the determination of eligibility for scholarship awards. The decision in each case would be made by a commission appointed by the governor of the State. After an award had been made and a scholarship granted, the committee bill provided, the continuance of the grant for the succeeding 3 years would not be determined by the university or college which the student might attend, on his scholarship, but by the committee appointed by the State.

I believe these rather loose provisions, without requirement for high standards, and I believe a grant plus a loan would attract the more serious and deserving students. Students who really want to go to college, would be willing to take the loan provision, which could be made available to them.

I did not consider it at the time, but I later thought that the House, having taken a very strong position against grants, might be more favorably inclined to the amendment I offered. They were not. But I wanted to make the statement. I believe reasonable grants plus loans, are more in the American tradition than the award of large grants.

I believe this is a helpful bill. I believe it will help materially to overcome a serious deficiency in teachers in the universities, and in the high schools, as well. I hope it will result in an improvement in the curricula of the secondary schools.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator. I always am sorry when I find myself in disagreement with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. The House did not have a yea-and-nay vote on the motion to strike out the scholarship provisions of the House bill. That was accomplished by a division, not by a yea-and-nay vote.

To be perfectly frank, I think the Senator's amendment seriously damaged the concept and the basis of the scholarship plan as embodied in the Senate committee bill. I think the amendment stripped the Senate conferees of bargaining power. When we go into a conference with the House, we cannot go stripped down. If we do, we cannot bargain, or get anything in return.

So far as the loan provision in the Senator's amendment is concerned, such a provision was already in the Senate committee bill, because that bill permitted any student who received a scholarship to apply for a loan under the loan provisions of the bill; and if he showed that he had need for the loan, there was no reason why he should not get the loan under the loan provision of the Senate bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Alabama has rendered a great service to the country in getting the bill through conference. This is the first major bill for assistance to education which will actually have been enacted. The Senator from Alabama has sponsored many bills in the Senate, but I believe this is the first major bill of this nature.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Alabama have joined in the sponsorship of many bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I compliment the Senator from Alabama for his success in this instance. He deserves great credit. I know he feels, as I feel, that this is not exactly the kind of bill we would have favored had we had our own way. We would have liked to provide assistance to education in general, and in a broader sense than is provided in this bill. Nevertheless, I am delighted that the bill has reached the point of acceptance.

I should like to ask the Senator 1 or 2 questions. On the subject of loans to students, are any restrictions placed on the nature of the studies which the students must undertake? Must they study science, for example?

Mr. HILL. No; there is no restriction as to the studies they may undertake. There is this provision, as I have said and wish to emphasize: In the making of loans, a preference is accorded students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, and modern foreign languages. In selecting the applicants for the loans, the students who are to benefit from the loans, those having such a background of preparation will receive special consideration. There is no restriction on which courses the borrower may select. It is entirely his own choice.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Suppose two students apply, one of whom is an excellent student not specializing in science, the other a mediocre student. Would the mediocre student still be given preference to the one who is not specializing in science but is of a far better capacity?

Mr. HILL. That would depend. The Senator used the word "mediocre." Whether the student was mediocre would depend upon how well he had performed in the sciences, or mathematics, or engineering, or a modern foreign language. If the other student was brilliant and capable and showed far more capacity to serve our country, more particularly to serve in a position vital to the national defense, I would say such a student would be selected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is important to show that the bill does not absolutely bar the student who is interested in a general liberal education.

Mr. HILL. When I opened the debate on the Senate bill, the bill which was under consideration by the Senate, I stated that the Federal Government from the very beginning had responsibility for the national defense and for the conduct of foreign affairs. Ten years ago, speaking on the Senate floor, I said America's first line of defense was the scientist's laboratory. I said foreign affairs were no longer foreign, and that what we were seeking to do was to meet our responsibility for defense, for the conduct of foreign affairs. Then I emphasized, too, that that did not mean that there was any depreciation of the need and necessity for the humanities and the other many important subjects. If America is to be strong, then we must strengthen the whole line. We must strengthen the whole front of education.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for that statement. I believe the Senator mentioned this subject, but I want to clarify it in my own mind. These loans may be paid off at the rate of 20 percent a year by anyone who enters the teaching profession. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. He may pay off up to 50 percent of the loan over a period of time at the rate of 10 percent of the loan for each year of teaching. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Twenty percent of half the loan.

Mr. HILL. The bill the committee reported to the Senate and the bill as it passed the Senate provided that the whole loan might be forgivable if the recipient taught for 5 years. However, the House bill had no provision with respect to forgiveness of the loans, and the conferees asked many questions about what their reception might be if they went back to the House with such a provision. So we had to compromise that problem and accommodate our views to theirs.

We came out of the conference with a report which embodies forgiveness of one-half of the loan provided the recipient of the loan teaches in a public elementary or secondary school.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the report provide for grants to communities for the installation of equipment, or are they only for research?

Mr. HILL. The conference report in title VII provides for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of modern communication mediums for educational purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A research program.

Mr. HILL. Primarily experimental research, to assist and foster research and experimentation in the development of the entire area, including not only television, which is most important, but also the audiovisual medium.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have been asked by the authorities in my hometown about the possibility of getting television in the high school. Would this bill render consultation advice to those people?

Mr. HILL. I should say they could receive consultation and advice and have the benefit of the research and experimentation carried on.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator yield before he leaves that subject?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] knows the Senate passed a bill allowing grants-in-aid for educational TV. That bill was reported by the House committee last week, but unfortunately the House, I understand, was in such a position that the bill could not be taken up. We assure the Senator that when January comes, that subject will be the first order of business in our committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have one additional question. Will this measure have any effect on the quality of the curriculums in the schools? Does it provide for guidance and counseling of the schools in regard to their curriculums?

Mr. HILL. No. The guidance and counseling will apply to the individual students. We have such a program now; we have had it for many years under our vocational educational system. As the Senator from Arkansas knows, that program was first established in 1917. It is a partnership program with the Federal Government, the States and the local communities, all of which are sharing in the cost of the program. The guiding and counseling are for the purpose of helping the individual students ascertain their best talents, and then to study the courses which will best develop their talents and also will best serve the Nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will this measure have any effect upon the selection of the able students? To put the question another way, is it intended to help develop better methods of ascertaining which students are of superior capacity?

Mr. HILL. That certainly would be one result; yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will this measure provide assistance to the authorities in the schools?

Mr. HILL. In the States; yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To locate and develop the best students?

Mr. HILL. Yes. The Senator from Arkansas has given much thought to this subject, and speaks with much authority on it; and I believe he will agree with me that one of our greatest problems is to locate the best students, and then, to stimulate, encourage, and challenge them to do their best to develop their talents to the maximum, always with the thought in mind of rendering the greatest possible service to the Nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Alabama is quite correct.

The problem of providing sufficient incentives to such students is in my opinion, a most serious one. I do not know that much can be done about it by means of this measure; but certainly that problem is of major concern to the whole country.

Mr. HILL. I say to my distinguished friend that that is the basic concept behind the scholarship program which was embodied in the bill the Senate committee reported to the Senate and also in the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe I would be derelict in the performance of my duty if I did not rise to utter a protest about the conference report, because it does not go nearly far enough in the direction of meeting the challenge the Russians have posed to us in the field of education.

The Congress has appropriated more than \$40 billion for purposes of defense; and in that regard the Congress added to that appropriation bill \$1 billion which the administration did not request.

But in connection with congressional consideration of the education bill, suddenly the Congress becomes more parsimonious in dealing with a program which the country requires if it is to meet the Soviet challenge, not only in terms of defense and economic matters, but also in terms of cultural matters and as regards every other phase of activity in our lives.

I utter this protest because I believe the country should understand that the conference report will not foot the bill; and, next year, the Congress will have to take even greater steps in order to cover the ground it is not covering today.

Certainly provisions for scholarships are needed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from New York introduced a scholarship bill which had many fine features.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I may say that, together with my colleague from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], I introduced on March 27, 1957, the first student-loan act, the Education Loan Act of 1957 (S. 1727).

We polled 200 universities on that bill; and, uniformly, they replied, "Student loans are fine; but we also need scholarships, in order to get into college at least 50 percent of the meritorious high-school graduates who are not now coming to college. If Members of Congress really want to do what we say we want to do, we must take steps to enable at least 50 percent of the meritorious high-school students who are not now going to college to enter college."

So the omission of the scholarship provisions is a very serious one; and I hope we shall not give up in our efforts to obtain the enactment of such provisions, because they are very greatly needed. We must provide for the college administrator the opportunity for both student loans and scholarships.

Furthermore, I desire to point out that no Federal aid is being provided for school construction. We talk about attracting people to the teaching profession, but we give them second-rate schools in which to teach; and we deprive the States of the resources with which to provide adequate salaries in order to encourage the teachers to remain in the teaching profession.

So, Mr. President, let us understand that the conference report is only a beginning—in a very real sense. Let no Senator delude himself into thinking that when he votes for adoption of the conference report, he votes to meet the monumental challenge the Russians have posed to us.

The fair-haired boys are the ones who will go to college; but under the provisions of the conference report, not enough young Americans will go to college.

However, some of the very wisest provisions of the bill are those which provide aid for vocational education. I believe those provisions are very good, and will be very helpful.

I only add, Mr. President, that we must go forward in making provision for scholarships and for Federal aid to school construction, in addition to doing more to improve the student-aid program.

The bill I introduced, S. 1727, contained provisions for what I called an FHA-type educational program; it would have guaranteed the loans to be made to students by banks and savings-and-loan associations throughout the Nation. After all, a young American who is educated has a lifetime ahead of him, and his future constitutes just as good security as does a house on which an FHA mortgage loan is placed.

We should expand the program enormously. Even \$260 million could be of real help to great numbers of students.

So I hope very much that the Senator from Alabama, with his great interest in this field, will move forward, at the next session, in terms of the enactment of provisions for an FHA-type program, as well as for enactment of the other programs.

I thank the Senator from Alabama very much indeed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York knows—as a student of history—that seldom, in connection with the handling of a new piece of legislation, is it possible to provide in the original act for all that its authors wish to have provided by it. In other words, it is necessary to make a start, and then to build on it.

I may say that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the Education Subcommittee, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is outstanding in his devotion to the cause of education. No Member of the Senate has been more devoted to that cause or has worked more in behalf of it or has made greater contributions to it than has the distinguished senior Senator from Montana.

I am certain that his subcommittee, as well as our full committee, will keep constantly in mind all that the distinguished Senator from New York has said this afternoon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, by way of conclusion, let me say to the Senator from Alabama that at no time in American history has a measure of the type we are advocating been enacted into law.

It is all very well for the distinguished ranking Democratic member of the Foreign Relations Committee and other members to say the Nation is falling behind and many of us are deeply conscious of these reverses, too; and that we are short on new ideas and are not measuring up to our responsibilities. But such comments are only effective as they move us to action.

The educational program we are advocating is one which will pay off. The issue we raise is whether the Government is helping with the education of the people, and whether the Government is providing sufficient funds to do that job. I merely wish to point that out.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, no one regretted more than did I to see the Senate take the action it did when it adopted

the Cooper amendment, the other evening, and then passed the bill, and thus very severely damaged the scholarship provision. I thought that provision went very much to the heart of the problem the Senator from New York has discussed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] have debated that matter sufficiently; so I shall not get into that debate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, inasmuch as I mentioned the name of the Senator from Kentucky, I yield now to him.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senate voted and accepted my amendment. So it became the Senate amendment, not just the Cooper amendment.

I stated my reasons when I offered the amendment; and I assume that when the Senate voted for the amendment, it accepted at least to some degree those reasons.

I return to my point; and I say—and say with respect for the Senator, it is my information—and I have heard this since the meeting of the conference committee—there never was any intention on the part of the House conferees to adopt the provisions for the scholarship program. Perhaps the Senate conferees should have insisted more strongly for the preservation of the scholarship concept which was provided in the bill by my amendment. I make that point.

At this time I should like to join my friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in saying that the conference report is a good one. It makes a start, although it does not meet the educational needs of the country.

In these last days, we have heard critical speeches in the Senate—not only of foreign policy, but of the direction of thought in the Nation, the character of the people, and the culture of our people.

If there are defects in our life, I suggest there is a way in which a universal effort can be made by the Congress to raise the level. It is in the field of education. An effort should be made to lift the standards of curriculums in the elementary and high schools of our country. We cannot raise them. We cannot force local schools to do it. But, as I have suggested several times, if the President of the United States could appoint a commission of great scholars and educators, not to study the defects of our educational system, for they have been studied enough, but to meet with governors and the heads of the educational systems of the States, to work with them, to encourage them, to urge them to take the necessary steps to lift the standards of curriculums in the secondary schools, perhaps something might be accomplished.

And adequate financing is necessary to improve our school programs. We shall have to determine whether we are willing to aid the States in school construction and teachers' salaries, if we really mean to raise the standards of education in this country.

I have always supported and voted for such measures. I shall continue to

do so. We have not met the greatest challenge of our Nation—that of education. We have not even approached it. I hope in the future we shall do what is necessary.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question. I have great confidence in the Senator. I think he is to be highly commended for the work he has done. What disturbs me about the conference report is that it seemed to me the important parts of the bill were the provisions under which Federal money would go to the individual student, and that the froth and the furbelows—although I do not mean that literally—consisted of provisions by which money would be channeled into State educational systems for various purposes—for guidance, counsel, and for various activities which the States can handle.

What I fear is that back from conference has come a bill which further reduces the heart of the bill—that is, the money going to the individual student—but which retains provisions for money being channeled into State educational systems.

Will the Senator give me his comments on that question?

Mr. HILL. As the Senator has heard me state, I regret the loss of the scholarship provision in the bill, but I wish to say to him that the great emphasis in the bill is still on the individual student. The loan program is devoted to the development of, and a challenge to and stimulus of, the individual student. The other programs to which the Senator from New Hampshire has referred have as their objective the development of the individual student to prepare him for service to the country.

Mr. COTTON. Approximately what proportion of the money provided in the bill will go to individual students, and what proportion will be channeled into the educational systems of the several States?

Mr. HILL. I could give the Senator a breakdown. For instance, there is a provision for grants, on a 50-50 matching basis, for the purpose of providing science equipment and audio-visual aids in high school. The purpose of such a program is not to help the particular school, but to help the student who is taking a course in physics, biology, or other science, so he may have the equipment to do his best work in that course.

Mr. COTTON. I recognize that the purpose is to help students in education. I appreciate the argument of the Senator. But to bring the matter down to brass tacks, what proportion of the money provided in the bill would go to the individual students—not to State educational systems for equipment, but to the individual students—in loans or otherwise, and what proportion would go to the State educational systems?

Mr. HILL. There is provision for loans which will go directly to the individual students. Funds, for instance, are provided for fellowships. That

money goes to the individual students taking graduate courses, primarily for teaching purposes. That money goes to the individual.

Mr. COTTON. Would the Senator say 25 percent of the Federal money will go to individuals, or 35 percent?

Mr. HILL. I would not want to hazard a guess on figures. I would have to sit down and compute the matter, in order to give the Senator an intelligent answer. If he wants me to compute it and put it in the RECORD, I shall do so. I would not want to say the amount would be 25 percent without at least having had an opportunity to sit down and check the figures.

Mr. COTTON. I voted for the bill with some qualms. However, I feel the "guts" of the bill, if the Senator will pardon the expression, the language with respect to scholarships, is cut out, and I almost feel I must vote against the conference report. I hope to be reassured by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The intestinal fortitude in this bill is for the individual student.

Mr. COTTON. I will say to my friend that intestinal fortitude is fine, but I am asking about money.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator will kindly turn to page 20 of the report, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Under section 303, which appears on that page, subparagraph (3), on the fourth line of that subparagraph, words have been inserted in the bill the Senate passed, reading "as determined by the State board for such State."

So that the subparagraph reads:

For the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge, as determined by the State board for such State, in fields necessary for the national defense.

The language "as determined by the State board for such State" was inserted in that section by the conferees. Will the Senator tell me why those words were put in there?

Mr. HILL. This language was worked out with the House conferees. The whole intent and purpose of the language is to train highly skilled technicians for the national defense. With reference to the added language, "as determined by the State board for such State," I think the Senator will agree with me we do not want someone in Washington to fix the curriculums in our schools, whether the schools be in Connecticut, Colorado, Alabama, or any other State. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the curriculums should be fixed by the State authorities. However, subject to that restriction, the funds are to be used for the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields necessary for the national defense.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator from Alabama assure me the purpose of that

language is not designed to expand existing programs?

Mr. HILL. No; it is not designed to expand programs such as now exist for example in agriculture or home economics. It is designed to provide assistance to area vocational programs in recognized occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge.

Mr. BUSH. There is no question about that?

Mr. HILL. There is no question about that.

Mr. BUSH. The only other question I have, if the Senator will permit me to ask it, relates to the same paragraph. After the words "highly skilled technicians" there were deleted from our draft of the bill the words "or semiprofessional personnel, which might be laboratory technicians. I wondered why that language was eliminated.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may answer that question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut is aware I was very much of the opinion the amendment should be offered.

Mr. BUSH. Indeed. The Senator was very helpful.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to answer the question in this way. First of all, this language is partly a compromise, as all language coming from a conference committee must be.

The item we wanted to get in the report was exactly what the Senator from Connecticut has in mind. We wanted to provide for highly skilled technicians. In other words, this is not to provide merely for training skilled workers in carpentry or lathe work. Actually, we want to train skilled technicians. The words "or semiprofessional personnel" were taken out. In the interim report of the President's Advisory Committee and in other places, these words were not used. Through common usage, "skilled technicians" has come to have a very specific meaning. It implies a skill and a technical ability above a high-school grade, with some scientific knowledge, instead of a simple manual dexterity. We want to bridge the gap between the skilled worker and the skilled scientist.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BUSH. That answers my question and satisfies my mind.

I thank both distinguished Senators.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the adoption of the conference report on H. R. 13247, a bill to provide Federal financial aid to education. Though I was and am opposed to Federal aid to education, since the States have never delegated the field of education to the Federal Government, I find an additional serious objection to the education bill agreed to by the Senate conferees.

The Senate conferees have agreed to accept certain provisions of the House bill which can have no other effect than to cause further deterioration of race relations, which have already been severely damaged. Mr. President, I refer

to the provision in the House bill which has been agreed to by the Senate conferees and which provides that student loan funds shall be administered by institutions of higher education, instead of by State commissions as was provided in the Senate bill. Under the House provision Federal moneys would be allocated to public and private institutions of higher education, for the purpose of making educational loans to students in attendance at the institutions.

The House method of administration causes me grave concern, Mr. President, because the administration now in power—or any future administration—could deny loan funds to any educational institution which follows a policy of segregation. The denial could be very simply accomplished by an executive order requiring the United States Commissioner of Education to withhold loan funds from any segregated institution. The same objective could be accomplished by the Commissioner of Education, himself, by means of an administrative regulation issued by him.

In the face of such an order, or administrative regulation, southern colleges would have to forego the benefits of the loan funds and likewise students in attendance at such colleges would have to forego the benefits of educational assistance loans. As a consequence, southern citizens would be taxed to establish loan funds which their children could not even use.

To say that such an Executive order or administrative regulation would never be issued does not allay my fears concerning this matter. I recall that statements of similar purport were made shortly prior to the dispatch of troops to Little Rock.

The fact is that there is nothing in the conference version of the bill, or in any Federal law, to prevent this administration, or any future administration, from denying loan funds to institutions which practice segregation. In view of the fact that political considerations outweigh good judgment in the councils of national administrations, it would be most unwise to adopt the proposed procedure regarding loan funds.

Mr. President, I do not charge that the loan fund administrative procedure has been purposely selected to bring about the consequences which I have described. Nonetheless, I would consider it a breach of faith with the people whom I represent, as well as a failure to meet my obligations to my Senate colleagues, if I did not point out the dangers which lie ahead if the administrative procedure agreed to by the Senate and House conferees is permitted to become law.

For these reasons, I feel that the Senate conferees should make a further effort to have the loan funds administered by State commissions, and, failing in that, should endeavor to have the loan fund title stricken from the bill altogether. Finally, Mr. President, I express my strongest and most sincere hope that the conference report will not be adopted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate, but I wish to say, as I

have tried to emphasize before, that it is clear, it is definite, it is positive, and it is absolute that for a student to receive a loan under the bill the student must first have been accepted for enrollment in a college or must be in the college. In other words, the student is in before any question of eligibility for the loan arises.

The argument which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has made could be made equally as well against the college housing program or against the Federal impacted area program. We passed a bill through the Senate within the last 30 days as to the latter program. I heard nothing from the Senator from South Carolina in the way of opposition to that bill. The argument could be made against that bill just as well as it is made against the education bill.

The argument the Senator from South Carolina has made could be made against the Vocational Education Act. Incidentally, it is interesting to recall that the basic Vocational Education Act, first passed in 1917, was fathered by the late Senator Ed Smith, of South Carolina. The act is known as the Smith-Hughes Act. That is the basic Vocational Education Act. One of the most important amendments to that act was the George-Barden Act, fathered by the late and beloved Senator whom we so much esteemed and revered, the late Senator George of Georgia. Every argument made this afternoon against the education bill could be made against the Smith-Hughes Act, against the George-Barden Act, and against the act which the Congress passed less than 30 days ago, the Federal Impacted Area Act.

The same argument could be made against the School Lunch Program Act. The argument could be made against the great Land Grant College Act, which has meant so much to this country. Perhaps the greatest landmark in education, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, was the Morrill Act, and the many amendments enlarging, extending, and augmenting that act. The same argument made by the Senator from South Carolina this afternoon could be made against that act and against the many amendments to the act.

The same argument could be made against all the different research grants made by the Federal Government—research grants to Clemson College in South Carolina, research grants to the University of South Carolina, and research grants to many other institutions throughout the country, not only in agriculture but in medicine, medical research, and many other fields of activity.

The same argument could be made against the grants which are made by the Atomic Energy Commission. Many grants are made to colleges and educational institutions.

The same argument could be made against the National Science Foundation Act. We reported from the committee a few days ago an amendment to the National Science Foundation Act, which would strengthen and fortify the act in making some of the grants being made today to our colleges and educational institutions, but I heard no word of protest from the Senator from South Carolina,

although the argument applied to that act as well as it might apply to this bill.

The same arguments might be made by the Senator from South Carolina against the Defense Department and its many programs providing scholarships for the strengthening of the national defense. The same arguments might be made with respect to many acts of Congress.

Seven or eight years ago I had a check made. Even at that time there were more than 125 acts of Congress providing some form of aid by the Federal Government to our schools and colleges, or to education. The argument of the Senator from South Carolina might well be made today against any of those acts.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I deem it appropriate to say at this time that final passage of this bill, with which the security of the country is so identified, will stand as one of the great goals of accomplishment of one of the ablest and most distinguished Members of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Alabama has labored long and hard, but fruitfully. The conference report which the Senate is about to approve is the climactic act which will send to the President of the United States a far-reaching bill which will not only enrich the lives of many American boys and girls, but will add vastly to the strength and security of the United States, involved, as it is, in a cold-war contest in which progress in technological education is vital to the security, strength, and defense not only of America, but of the free world.

I congratulate the able senior Senator from Alabama and recognize him as one of the great and fruitful Members of the United States Congress.

Mr. HILL. I thank my good friend. He has certainly proved his friendship this afternoon. I am deeply grateful to him for his most generous words. I appreciate them not only because they come from a friend, but even more particularly, because they come from one who, throughout his life, has been so devoted to the cause of education. No Member of this body has worked or fought harder to advance the cause of education than has the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It has been a great privilege to serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, particularly on the Education Subcommittee with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama.

Hearings were held lasting about 7½ weeks. The distinguished Senator from Alabama was patient. His inquiries were searching. He brought before the committee many American educators, outstanding leaders in the military field, college presidents, leading officials of the Association of Colleges, and representatives of every branch of the educational life of this country.

The evidence showed conclusively that we needed to do something about education in the United States. I do not remember a single witness who did not believe we should do something. They varied in the methods they would use. Some thought fellowship to be more important than scholarships. Many thought that direct grants to colleges for construction would be more important than scholarships. They varied only in the methods they would pursue to strengthen our educational system.

Writers in magazines and many leading newspapers in America, in commenting on the achievements of this Congress, state that the opportunity which this Congress had was to do something about education, and that our lack in that field, as a people, was greater than in any other branch of the great subjects on which we legislate.

Those writers pointed out that the realization last fall, with the launching of the satellites, that we needed to do something about education, had begun to lag. Public interest had begun to lag, and these writers pointed out that it was up to Congress to alert the American people.

We are making a timid step of less than \$1 billion for a 4-year program, but it is the most advanced step since the Land Grant College Act of the 1860's. It is a long forward step.

I believe the country expects the Congress to do something to stimulate public education. It is done in this bill, in such a way as to preserve local control, and yet provide the impetus of a national surge.

In my own State there has been considerable sentiment against Federal aid to education; but when the Land Grant College Act was passed during the War Between the States, the first public State-supported institution of higher learning in my State which actually opened its doors to students was the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, which opened in 1871, under the Land Grant College Act.

Under the stimulus of that Federal aid, many other publicly supported colleges then opened their doors.

I hope that a similar result will be achieved this time. With a little Federal stimulus I hope we can produce a great deal of State and local action, in the cities, counties, and local school districts, as well as in the junior colleges.

This bill will stimulate learning. It will stimulate teaching. It will stimulate achievement. I regret that the provision for scholarships was eliminated; but we have left a provision for loans. A loan is a scholarship of a type. When I attended college we thought a scholarship was a loan. I call these loans loan-scholarships. They will stimulate a desire on the part of students to get a loan and go to college.

There are many different types of scholarships. Quite a number of colleges have athletic scholarships. Some colleges have as many as 200 band scholarships. The scholarships provided for in the bill are in the field of intellectual endeavor. The bill is a be-

ginning, an incentive to scholarship in institutions of higher learning. I do not mean to intimate that such institutions lack scholarship, but this bill places the national stamp on it. Scholarship is what the Nation wants.

Again I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his leadership in this field. Think what it will mean to the American people. He has had the patience and tact to draw together many distinguished witnesses before his committee, leaders in all branches of education from all over the country.

I believe that his unfailing courtesy to everyone enabled him to do more than any other person or combination of persons. He is responsible, more than anyone else, for the fact that such a bill is before the Senate. It is the result of the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his kind words. He has been a devoted member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He made many fine contributions to the bill. He not only sat with us during the many long days of hearings and executive sessions of the committee, but he was one of the conferees on the bill. He was a most important member of the team which brings this bill to the floor of the Senate today.

I thank the Senator from Texas, and congratulate him for the many fine contributions he made to the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. SPARKMAN. At this late hour I do not intend to take much of the time of the Senate, but I do wish to allow this opportunity to pass without expressing my feeling of gratitude for the great job which has been done under the able leadership of my senior colleague from Alabama in bringing to us, for the first time, in completed form, an education bill.

This is not a short-term accomplishment. I remember that 22 years ago, when I first ran for Congress, I had written on the back of my little campaign card a few planks. One of them was "Federal Aid for Education Without Federal Control."

When I came to Congress my colleague was here as the senior Member in the House of Representatives from my State. He became one of the leaders in the cause of Federal aid to education. He has not ceased to work for that purpose and has advocated it during the years which have passed since that time.

It was 12 years ago that there was first put through the Senate a Federal aid to education bill. That was followed a year later with another bill. However, this is the first time that a bill of this magnitude has cleared both Houses and is now about to become an act of Congress.

I agree with what the distinguished chairman, my colleague from Alabama, has said, that the bill certainly does not satisfy us. Probably it does not completely satisfy anyone. However, it is a

great step forward. It is a great accomplishment, one which I believe will go far toward strengthening our country and securing our national welfare country-wide.

I wish to commend and congratulate my distinguished colleague, and those who have worked with him, for having accomplished this result.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague for his very kind and generous words. He and I have been closely associated together for a good many years, and through all those years we have worked in the closest cooperation and in the closest teamwork on behalf of the cause of education, in trying to do something for our schools and for our colleges and for our children. True education has had no more loyal and devoted friend than my colleague from Alabama.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. For 14 years I have worked in the Senate with the senior Senator from Alabama on education and health legislation. On our committee we know the Senator from Alabama as the leader in the Senate in both of those fields. Sometimes facetiously and good-naturedly, and always with a meaningful point, we refer to the Senator from Alabama in our committee either as Dr. HILL or Professor HILL. Those two titles pretty well label the standing he has in the Senate in his conscientious and able statesmanship in these fields.

The pending bill is the best bill we could get this year. It is not as good as some of us wanted. The chairman himself would have preferred a far better bill, could he have had one. However, the final result shows how right the chairman was through all our deliberations this year when he kept pointing out to us that the bill he sponsored in the first instance was probably even more than we could get from the House.

I want him and his colleagues on the committee to know that in January they can count on me to continue to work shoulder and shoulder with them for much-needed health and education legislation.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Oregon is a real professor. He taught for many years and was the dean of the Oregon Law School. He brought to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a magnificent background of experience, with knowledge in the field of education. He was always working and fighting for the cause of education. He has made innumerable contributions to the cause. I express my appreciation and my thanks and my congratulations to him.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in reply to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I agree that an Executive order could be issued cutting off Federal funds which are now going to impacted areas or into State programs of vocational education. However, the question I ask is why adopt another program—and this is a new program—

which will give further opportunity for such an order to be issued.

Back in 1917 the vocational education program was born. It was born during the war as a temporary measure, to provide for the training of mechanics and other skilled people. Then finally it became a permanent law, and it has been on the statute books ever since. The new program provided by H. R. 13247 is more than a specialist program. It is a general program. It is the beginning—and I want to emphasize this to my colleagues—of general Federal aid to education. If that is what my colleagues want, then I presume they will vote for the conference report. If that is not what they want, I presume they will vote against the conference report.

The word "education" is not even mentioned in the United States Constitution. The field of education has never been delegated to the Federal Government. And, as all Senators know, the Federal Government has only those powers which are delegated to it by the Constitution.

Merely because in the past action has been taken which was contrary to the Constitution is no reason why we should go into another program, a new program, which also contravenes the Constitution. If any Senator can give me the authority for the Federal Government to go into the field of education, I should like to hear him express it. It has been mentioned that the program is designed to protect the national security and provide for national defense. Is it in the interest of national security? Is it tied to national defense? If this program were tied to national defense, I could understand how it might come within the authority delegated to Congress in the Constitution. However, there is no provision in the bill, so far as I know, which will require a student to take courses related to national defense. I believe the distinguished Senator from Arkansas asked that question of the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Alabama stated that a student could take any course he selects. After a student obtains a loan, derived from Federal moneys, what reason is there to believe he will take courses in science or engineering or similar subjects which will promote national defense? He cannot be compelled to do so by the terms of the bill. The student could take a course in social welfare or in flower arranging, for example.

Furthermore, after he has finished his course, what requirement is there in the bill that he go into national defense work, either with the Government or with private research, or in any other way? I do not know of any provision in the bill which makes it a requirement for the recipient under the bill to serve in a capacity directly beneficial to the national defense.

Therefore, if a student is not required to take courses in science or engineering or other fields directly related to national defense, and if he can take any course he wishes to take, and is not required to apply his knowledge in some position in national defense, what right

has the Federal Government to furnish money for his education?

As I said, education is not the responsibility of the Federal Government. Education is the responsibility of the school districts, in the first place, then of the counties, and finally of the States of this Nation. It is the responsibility of the local subdivisions of the States and the States themselves, and not of the Federal Government.

Unless the educational purposes are directly related to national defense, there is no reason for the Federal Government to enter this field or for us to appropriate money for that purpose. This new program is another wedge into existing educational systems which will eventually plunge the Federal Government into the general field of education. In my opinion such a result would be one of the worst things that could happen.

It has been said that there would be Federal aid without Federal control. How do we know that any day, even the day after the bill became law, the Office of Education will not issue a regulation or, that an executive order will not be issued, providing that no Federal funds will henceforth go to impacted areas or to vocational schools which practice segregation?

In the first place, the Federal Government has no business in a field belonging to the States. In the second place, the program would jeopardize certain schools which will have to pay for the education of the children in other States beyond their boundaries.

Therefore, speaking for myself, I want to be on record as being opposed to the conference report.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, no one worked longer, harder, or more devotedly on the education bill, on which the Senate has just taken final action, by means of its approval of the conference report, than did the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Unfortunately, and much to his regret, it was impossible for him to be present today.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately prior to the vote on the conference report, a statement in behalf of the conference report, as prepared by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

I am deeply gratified that the Senate and House conferees have today agreed upon an education bill. I believe the bill will provide significant help in strengthening the American education system in the interests of national security.

Except for the omission of scholarships, the bill reported by the conference committee closely parallels the recommendations of the President. I sincerely regret that we were unable to obtain a limited scholarship program which would have given national recognition to intellectual achievement. However, I am convinced that the conference bill is a positive step toward meeting our most pressing educational needs.

The bill seeks to mobilize our potential resources of talented manpower more effectively through the establishment of several related programs, including:

1. A broad student-loan program to assure that all qualified students may obtain a higher education, and to reduce the number of able students who drop out of college due to financial hardship.

2. Grants to the States to strengthen mathematics, science, and foreign language instruction in the elementary and secondary schools.

3. A selective program of fellowships to reduce the critical shortage of college-level teachers.

4. Regular testing to identify the aptitudes of all secondary schoolchildren, and strengthened guidance and counselling programs to insure that students are encouraged to pursue their maximum intellectual development.

5. Institutes to strengthen the teaching of modern foreign languages, and centers of area studies to produce the trained personnel needed for overseas service in government and industry.

The bill also provides for research in the educational use of television and other audio-visual techniques, training of additional scientific technicians under the vocational education program, translation and dissemination of scientific information from abroad, and improvement of the collection of statistical data for the proper evaluation of our educational strengths and weaknesses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—66

Aiken	Hennings	McNamara
Allott	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Barrett	Hill	Morse
Beall	Hoblitzell	Morton
Bennett	Humphrey	Mundt
Bush	Jackson	Murray
Carroll	Javits	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Chavez	Jordan	Potter
Church	Kefauver	Proxmire
Clark	Kennedy	Purtell
Cooper	Kerr	Revercomb
Cotton	Knowland	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Lausche	Symington
Ervin	Long	Thye
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
Gore	Mansfield	Wiley
Green	Martin, Iowa	Yarborough
Hayden	McClellan	Young

NAYS—15

Bible	Dworshak	Schoeppel
Bridges	Eastland	Stennis
Byrd	Goldwater	Talmadge
Capehart	Malone	Thurmond
Curtis	Russell	Williams

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Bricker	Holland	Payne
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Carlson	Ives	Smathers
Flanders	Jenner	Smith, N. J.

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXHIBIT A

INDUSTRY SUPPORTS HIGHER EDUCATION

Russia's scientific achievements have awakened America to the need of training more scientists and engineers. Many programs have been suggested including Federal scholarships for gifted students in science and engineering.

I am impressed by the fact that so many of our leading corporations, foundations, and other groups have taken steps to assist worthy but needy students to develop their God-given talents.

Four years ago, the General Motors Corp. inaugurated a program of scholarships. Today there are more than 3,000 potential scientists and engineers who are pursuing scientific studies with General Motors' assistance. The General Motors scholarship program shows that American industry is meeting its obligation to provide the talent to meet its future needs.

I believe that a statement prepared by the General Motors Corp. on the operation of its scholarship program since its inauguration 4 years ago is of such interest that I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

More than 3,000 potential scientists and engineers are in school with General Motors assistance now that GM's expanded program of aid to higher education has become fully

operative, President Harlow H. Curtice said today.

"These GM scholars represent the highly skilled men and women of tomorrow who will push back the limitless frontiers of space, unlock the energy of the sun, and advance our technology for the benefit of man everywhere," he said.

Mr. Curtice took note of GM's contribution in the world race for technical skills in announcing the winners of 114 4-year college scholarships under the corporation's national scholarship plan.

These winners, all of them honor students, will join 302 others selected under another scholarship program—the GM college plan—at colleges and universities across the land where 1,200 GM scholarship holders from the previous 3 years already are preparing for their careers.

Almost 70 percent of all scholarship winners so far have indicated career choices in the scientific and engineering fields. This ratio has held steady or increased each year of the program. With a revolving total of 1,600 scholarship winners in college each year, the number in scientific and engineering fields should exceed 1,000 annually, Mr. Curtice said. Equally important are the remainder who have chosen careers in teaching, business and other professions.

In addition to the estimated 1,000 scholarship winners taking scientific and engineering courses, some 2,300 students are enrolled at General Motors Institute in Flint, Mich., which offers cooperative courses in engineering. General Motors has operated this school for 37 years.

"In the minds of all our scholarship winners and in the minds of tens of thousands like them at our colleges and universities lies the stake of the free world," Mr. Curtice declared. "Never before in our history have we so desperately needed brain power. Our young people must be prepared to out-think and out-do their Soviet counterparts if we are to win the race of survival."

The scholarship winners announced today have already demonstrated some of this ability. More than half ranked first in their high school graduating classes, or were straight A students. Another 40 edited school publications, many were outstanding athletes, and practically all were leaders in student government and their church organizations.

Their outstanding secondary school record is matched by the scholastic aptitude demonstrated by GM scholarship holders now in college. Based on the first 2 years of the program, one-third of the award winners are in the upper 5 percent of their classes, one-half in the upper 10 percent and four-fifths in the upper 25 percent.

GM scholarship winners under both the college and national plans receive \$200 to \$2,000 a year, depending upon each student's need. All private colleges and universities which have GM scholarship winners, get unrestricted annual grants-in-aid of \$500 to \$800 for each scholarship winner. Total cost of GM's program of support to higher education is more than \$5 million a year.

The national plan winners, who are free to choose any accredited college they desire, were selected on the basis of national competitive examinations taken by more than 20,000 high school boys and girls in all 48 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. Final selection from semifinalists was made by a panel of 16 distinguished educators at Princeton, N. J., on the basis of scholastic records and leadership qualities.

Three hundred and two additional scholarships under the college plan are awarded each year by a selected list of 180 colleges and universities. Student benefits are determined the same way under both programs. Students are free to choose their courses of study and are under no obligation of future employment by GM.

In addition to its scholarships plans, General Motors makes grants-in-aid to State and regional associations of colleges, the United Negro College Fund, and the National Fund for Medical Education which benefit 155 other colleges.

ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED NATIONS FORCE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on Senate Concurrent Resolution 109.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 109) to express the sense of the Congress on the establishment of the United Nations force, which were, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That it is the sense of the Congress that consideration should immediately be given by the General Assembly of the United Nations to the development, within its permanent structure, of such organization and procedures as will enable the United Nations promptly to employ suitable United Nations forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that threaten international peace and security.

And to strike out the preamble.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJUSTMENT IN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on Senate bill 3379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3379) to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, which was, on page 3, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 5. No annuity of a retired officer shall be increased under any section of this act in an amount in excess of \$500 per annum. No annuity of a survivor annuitant shall be increased under any section of this Act in an amount in excess of \$250 per annum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE HOUSING BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a bill, which is introduced by me, on behalf of myself and the Sena-

tor from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; and I ask that the bill lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 4323) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT), was received, read the first time by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me say that the bill is introduced in an effort to have a housing bill passed by Congress at this session. We have had numerous conferences. The bill I have introduced today is greatly pared down or reduced in the amounts provided, as compared with the provisions of the bill the Senate has passed. However, the substance of the bill I have introduced today is the same as the substance of the bill the Senate has passed.

A bill which in many respects provided for even more than did the bill the Senate passed lacked only 6 votes of obtaining a two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives.

It seems to me that the bill I have introduced this afternoon, modest though it is, is greatly needed in order to keep housing going until the next session of Congress convenes in January; and certainly this bill should be able to clear the barriers in both Houses.

It is my hope that it will be possible for us to submit this bill as an amendment to some House bill which comes before us, and then send the House bill, as thus amended, back to the House, and thus give the House membership an opportunity to determine whether a housing bill will be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have examined the bill the able Senator from Alabama has introduced. As he has said, the amounts provided by it are substantially less than those provided by the bill the Senate has passed; and those changes should, in my opinion, be sufficient to make this bill quite acceptable.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How does the new bill deal with the acquisition of military housing?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The bill retains the language as it passed the Senate, with the exception of the suggestion which was made by the Senator from South Dakota that the appointment of the Commissioners be made by the court, rather than upon nomination by the parties concerned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have just examined the text of the bill as it is at the desk. I note the change is made that the parties to be appointed by the court, in case a commission is used, would be qualified disinterested persons. That is good. But in the mili-

tary construction bill we used the word "may" instead of "shall." The language in the print as it is at the desk now uses the word "shall," which would be objectionable, and which would be contradictory to what the Senate provided in the military construction bill.

Would the Senator object to changing the word "shall" to "may"?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would object. Of course, that is something which can be handled when the bill comes up, if it does come up, in the form of an amendment. I may point out to the Senator that the military construction bill as it passed the Senate had the word "shall" in it. It was in the conference that the word was changed to "may." I certainly objected to it, and I still object to it, because I think, as a matter of right, the person whose property is being taken ought to have that privilege.

We have examined the laws in connection with condemnation and other proceedings. We find in those cases it is a matter of right. I believe where the Government is told it can step in and take property away from people, the person from whom the property is being taken by the Government ought to have the right—not the discretion—to ask that the value of the property be fixed by a commission. I certainly would argue for that right; but it is something which can be handled when the proposed amendment is under discussion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, the Senator may introduce the bill in any form he wishes, but I think the court should not be told it must use commissioners. I would be in favor of the Senator's proposal, but I do not think the court should be told that it must. If the bill comes up, I shall certainly express my opinions on the matter and try to develop that argument, which was persuasive in conference.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is difficult to hear in this Chamber today.

Did the Senator introduce his proposal as a new bill or as an amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I introduced it as a bill, but I said I hoped to add it as an amendment to some bill from the House that comes to the Senate, in order that it might go back to the House and that the House might have an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Do I understand correctly that the Senator's bill changes the formula for the acquisition of Wherry housing projects?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We simply restate the language contained in the housing bill which passed the Senate before the Armed Services Committee handled this matter. May I remind the Senator from Georgia that the military construction bill, as it passed the Senate, had the same provisions in it so far as concerns giving the persons the right to name the commissioners.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was the result of a clerical error which transpired in committee; but I had heard—and many rumors become rampant at this late date in the session—that the formula for fixing the valuation of Wherry housing units is altered in this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not want to quibble, but when the Senator talks about altering, I point out that the Senate has agreed to the language in the housing bill as it passed the Senate. We are using the same language which was adopted by the Senate in that bill. It is true the wording is not the same, but if the Senator will read the debates in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the military construction bill was under consideration, I think he will find that the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] said these things would be taken into consideration, which simply meant that consideration shall be given to replacement value and fair depreciation.

So far as I know, that is the only place we depart from what the Senator has called the formula. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who was handling the military construction bill, which was passed, had said these would be factors taken into consideration, along with any other factors which might be controlling on a court, wherever the case was being tried.

Mr. RUSSELL. I dislike to appear in opposition to anything proposed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, but it seems to me there is going to be a clash of opinion in the committees with respect to the Wherry housing projects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Armed Services Committee would take over the Wherry housing jurisdiction, I think our committee would be pleased to get rid of it. But I remind the Senator Wherry housing started in the Banking and Currency Committee. The measure was introduced originally by Senator Wherry and Senator Maybank jointly. The Banking and Currency Committee referred it to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The committees have joint jurisdiction. I would be glad to have the question of jurisdiction cleared as between the two committees. I have never liked Wherry housing. I did not like the proposition written into the law that gave the Armed Services Committee the right to take it over—in fact, ordered it to take it over. I have not liked it, but I do believe if we are going to take over the property, then adequate compensation ought to be paid to the owners of the projects.

Mr. RUSSELL. The owners have recourse to law. They are privileged to go before a jury and make their case.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And wait from 2 to 4 years to get compensation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Government has to pay into the court the amount found owing to the owners.

Mr. President, I realize this bill cannot pass as a separate bill, and will have to be appended to some other measure; but for the time being, I object to the second reading of the bill today.

Mr. President, I hope the objection is noted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection will be noted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I objected to the second reading of the bill today. I want to make that clear for the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over for a second reading.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago I objected to the second reading of the housing bill, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I have consulted with the Committee on Armed Services and members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I wish to withdraw my objection.

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to obtain an analysis of the bill. I do not know what it contains. On that basis, I object to the second reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS DISTRESSED AS THE RESULT OF NATURAL CALAMITY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House to S. 3942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3942) for the relief of certain aliens distressed as the result of natural calamity in the Azores Islands, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 4, after "issued" insert "(A)"; on page 1, line 6, after "act," insert "and (B) a number of special nonquota immigrant visas not to exceed the annual quota allocated under the Immigration and Nationality Act to the quota area of the Netherlands to aliens specified in section 3 of the act"; on page 1, line 6, strike out "immigrants," and insert "immigrants"; on page 1, line 7, strike out "and to their spouses and their" and insert "The spouse of any such alien and his"; on page 1, line 10, strike out "1953" and insert "1958"; on page 1, line 10, after "them" insert "may be issued special nonquota immigrant visas notwithstanding the numerical limitations herein provided"; on page 1, line 11, after "under" insert "clause (A) of section 1 of"; on page 2, line 3, strike out "January 1, 1958" and insert "September 1, 1958"; on page 2, after line 5, insert:

SEC. 3. Visas authorized to be issued under clause (B) of section 1 of this act shall be issued only to nationals or citizens of the Netherlands who have been displaced from their usual place of abode in the Republic of Indonesia subsequent to January 1, 1949, and who were residing in continental Netherlands on the enactment date of this act.

On page 2, line 6, strike out "3" and insert "4"; on page 2, line 6, strike out "by" where it appears the first time and insert "to be issued under"; on page 2, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 5. Aliens receiving visas under clause (A) of this act shall be exempt from paying the fees prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

On page 2, line 15, strike out "4" and insert "6"; on page 2, line 19, strike out "5" and insert "1"; on page 2, line 20, strike out "December 31, 1959", and insert "June 30, 1960".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain distressed aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on August 6, 1958, the Senate passed S. 3942, to provide for the issuance of 1,500 special nonquota immigrant visas prior to December 31, 1959, to certain nationals of Portugal, and to their spouses and children, who have been displaced from their usual place of abode in the Azores Islands as a result of earthquakes and volcanic eruptions.

The House of Representatives passed S. 3942, with amendments, to provide for the issuance of an additional number of special nonquota immigrant visas not to exceed the annual quota allocated under the Immigration and Nationality Act to the quota area of the Netherlands to certain nationals or citizens of the Netherlands who have been displaced from their usual place of abode in the Republic of Indonesia subsequent to January 1, 1949, and who were residing in continental Netherlands on the enactment date of this act.

The bill was also amended to extend the cutoff date to June 30, 1960; to exempt the aliens receiving visas under this act from the payment of fees prescribed in the Immigration and Nationality Act; and to provide for the issuance of special nonquota visas to families of principal applicants without regard to the numerical limitation.

Under the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, approximately 4,500 principal applicants would be eligible to receive the special nonquota visas authorized to be issued under this act.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 3942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi. [Putting the question.]

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have some questions I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, may we have order, so I can hear the distinguished Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until there is order. Senators will please desist from talking or leave the Chamber.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to have persons sit down in the Chamber, so we can hear what these bills are all about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will please resume their seats or retire to the rear of the Chamber. The

29. FARM-CITY WEEK. Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 546, designating the week of November 21-27, 1958, as National Farm-City Week. (pp. 17967, 18001-2) This measure will now be sent to the President.
30. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 13489, the military construction appropriation bill for 1959, and acted on amendments in disagreement. (pp. 17901-5, 18002-3) This bill will now be sent to the President.
31. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Received from this Department a report on orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by CCC and the expansion of markets for surplus commodities, pursuant to Public Law 540, 84th Congress. p. 17758
32. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Symington discussed the feed grain and livestock situation, stating that "because it would appear that we may now be planning disaster, and because there may still be time to avoid it, herewith is presented an analysis of what is facing the feed-grain-livestock segment of our farm economy," and suggested alternative programs for dealing with these commodities. pp. 17766-8
Sen. Morse inserted several articles on President Theodore Roosevelt's views on farm problems, public power, and co-ops. pp. 17780-2
33. GOVERNMENT SECURITY. Sen. Morse inserted several League of Women Voters' letters discussing the Government's loyalty and security program. pp. 17778-9
34. FOREIGN AID. Sens. Mansfield and Malone discussed the foreign aid program. pp. 17783, 17803-21
35. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Curtis inserted a speech by Sen. Hruska discussing recent improvements in the REA program. pp. 17795-6
Sen. Anderson inserted a summary of Atomic Energy activity during the 85th Congress, including power reactor developments. pp. 17880-1
36. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sen. Long inserted his statement discussing economic conditions, including tables on consumer and wholesale prices, and interest rates. pp. 17800-3
37. PUBLIC WORKS. Sen. Chavez inserted a statement on activities of the Committee on Public Works during the 85th Congress. pp. 17822-5
38. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Anderson discussed the record of the 85th Congress in dealing with water resources. pp. 17881-4
39. MEATPACKERS. Sen. O'Mahoney inserted his statement discussing the enactment of H. R. 9020, the packers and stockyards bill. pp. 17992-3
40. ACCOMPLISHMENTS. Sen. Johnson inserted summaries on the accomplishments of Senate committees, and the "legislative record" of the 2nd session of the 85th Congress. pp. 18003-16, 18016-46
41. ADJOURNMENT. Both Houses adjourned sine die. Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 704, stating that the 86th Congress shall convene at noon on Wed., Jan. 7, 1959. This measure will now be sent to the President. pp. 17989, 18001, 17921

HOUSE - August 23, 1958

42. PUBLIC DEBT. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 13580, the public debt increase bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 17900-1
43. EDUCATION. Agreed, 212 to 85, to the conference report on H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 17905-17
44. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Schwengel commended the achievements made under this Administration's farm policies. pp. 17959-60
Rep. Thompson, N. J., discussed the accomplishments of the 85th Congress, and the program submitted by 80 House members early in 1957. He stated that the threat of Presidential veto circumscribed their farm program plans. pp. 17982-5
45. VIRGIN ISLANDS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 12226, to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act, including authority to operate salt water distillation facilities, and continuation of authority for sugar production. p. 17917 This bill will now be sent to the President.
46. FRUITS. On the objection of Reps. Davis, Ga., Byrnes, Wis., and Ford, passed over H. R. 11056, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act so as to extend restrictions on certain imported citrus fruits, dried fruits, and nuts. p. 17922
47. MINING. Passed as reported, S. 2039, to clarify the requirements on the performance of labor imposed as a condition for holding Federal mining claims. The Senate concurred in the House amendment. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 17924-5, 17877-8
48. FORESTRY. At the request of Rep. Byrnes, Wis., passed over S. 3587, to authorize the Agriculture and Interior Departments to study and report on the advisability of establishing a national park in the Wheeler Peak-Lehman Caves area of the Snake Range in eastern Nev. p. 17924
Passed without amendment S. 3741, to provide regular National Forest status to most lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 17925
49. CROP INSURANCE. Passed as reported H. R. 13262, to eliminate the prohibition against crop insurance being made available to certain counties which do not have wide participation in the program. p. 17925
50. BUILDINGS. Passed without amendment S. 3142, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to authorize the leasing of Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 17926-7
51. CONTRACTS. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 11749, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 17905
52. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Rep. Cramer criticized those who recommend "Greater Government spending and sharply reduced taxes" as the cure for economic ills, and asserted that "this Democrat-controlled Congress" was "the highest, most lavish spending Congress in the history of this great Republic." He cited as an example the farm bill, which he stated would have cost \$2.5 billion. pp. 17939-42

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 612. No part of the funds provided in this act shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 110 per centum of the value as determined by the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, except: (a) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court, (b) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee, and (c) where the estimated value is less than \$25,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12. On page 10, line 23, insert the following:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 613. Such appropriations of the Department of Defense, available for obligation during the current fiscal year, as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense shall be available for the purposes of section 1 of the act approved April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78): *Provided*, That any such appropriations so utilized shall be accounted for under the limitation established by section 4 of said act."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 614. Such appropriations of the Department of Defense, available for obligation during the current fiscal year, as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense shall be available for the purposes of section 1 of the act approved April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78): *Provided*, That any such appropriations so utilized shall be accounted for under the limitation established by section 4 of said act."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENDING RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951 FOR 6 MONTHS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11749) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, preceding "National" insert "the."

Page 2, line 2, after "Administration," insert "Section 103 (b) of such act is amended by inserting 'the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration,' after 'the Administrator of General Services.'"

Page 2, line 3, strike out "amendment" and insert "amendments."

Page 2, strike out all after line 10 over to and including line 3 on page 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the committee be kind enough to tell the House the action taken on the part of the Senate with respect to the amendment having to do with the court of appeals?

Mr. MILLS. Let me refer to the fact that the Senate adopted two amendments. The first is a technical amendment with respect to section 2 of the bill. As it passed the House, section 2 provided that contracts entered into by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration would be subject to renegotiation. There was an imperfection in the language on this section and the Senate amendment merely perfects the language to carry out the original intention of the House.

The second amendment adopted by the Senate is a substantive amendment and deletes from the bill as it passed the House section 3. The Senate took this action, so I am informed, because the Senate Finance Committee had not had an opportunity in the short time left for legislating to give adequate consideration to that section of the bill.

It further developed that the language in section 3 of the House bill, perhaps, was not as perfect as it should have been to carry out the intent to allow appeals from the Tax Court to the circuit court of appeals. The Finance Committee in its report said:

There was insufficient time for adequate consideration of this section of the bill, thus it was stricken with the understanding that this subject would be given thorough consideration in connection with the next extension of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I want it to be clear that in taking this action on agreeing to this Senate amendment, we on this side do so without prejudice to the amendment and solely because of the fact that the other body did not have an opportunity to give adequate consideration to it. Of course, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, and as stated in the House report, the Committee on Ways and Means is going to make a study of the entire subject of renegotiation in the next session of the Congress. At that time I am sure the subject involved in section 3 will be considered. In the event that the committee should again decide to report legislation further extending the Renegotiation Act and include therein the right to appeal from the Tax Court to the Circuit Court of Appeals, the committee could provide for that appeal to be available with respect to cases now pending in the Tax Court. In that event there would be no loss to anyone of the opportunity to appeal through failure of the Congress to adopt section 3 at this time.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means in asking that the House concur in the Senate amendments to legislation extending for 6 months the Renegotiation Act of 1951. The Senate amendments with respect to substantive changes deleted section 3 of the House-passed bill. This section was intended to provide judicial review of decisions of the Tax Court in renegotiation cases. The Senate Finance Committee report indicates that the Senate action in deleting this provision is without prejudice to the proposal of appellate review and in fact assures that thorough consideration will be given to this matter in connection with the next extension of the act. It is with that understanding that I have agreed to accept the Senate amendment deleting the review provision. It will be my hope that the inclusion of review procedure under the act will be made in such a manner as to protect the appeal rights of those cases that may be disposed of between the present time and the enactment into law of the next piece of legislation dealing with this subject.

The House action on this bill in agreeing to the Senate amendments represents the last legislation to be brought to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 85th Congress. It is appropriate, therefore, that I should acknowledge the truly outstanding work that has been done by my esteemed friend and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. During his period of service on the Committee on Ways and Means he has consistently served with great distinction and demonstrated outstanding ability and thorough knowledge of the subject matter under consideration. Despite his past record of very significant achievement I believe it fair to state that he has surpassed his previous attainments in the service he has rendered since becoming chairman in January of this year. Mr. Mills has been fair and understanding. He has been patient in exasperating times and courageous in difficult times. In short, Mr. Speaker, WILBUR MILLS has done what all of us knew he would do—he has established himself as a great chairman of a great committee. It is my hope that he succeeds in getting well-deserved rest during the adjournment period.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs, and for other purposes, and ask

unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama whether I can believe the evidence before my eyes that the House conferees did not insist on including in the conference report the antidiscrimination amendment which was passed by the House, both as to title II and title III. It seems to me that the amendment, which read that there should be no discrimination upon the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or sex, should certainly have been included in the conference report; and I am wondering if the gentleman could possibly explain why the House conferees did not make a strong and hearty and successful effort for its inclusion and whether it would not have been possible to have kept the amendment in. I consider it a great loss to the bill and a step backward in the cause of education.

Mr. ELLIOTT. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois with reference to that item the House adopted the Senate language which did not contain the amendment to which the gentleman refers; the decision was reached, also, in light, I might say, of the discussion that the amendment in this bill was unneeded and would actually have no effect one way or the other.

Mrs. CHURCH. I withdraw my reservation of objection to consideration of the report, Mr. Speaker, although I shall continue my objection to the acceptance of the Senate position in this matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what are the grounds upon which he thinks that this amendment was not necessary, in view particularly of the fact that obviously in matters of this kind there is wide discretion. I would like to have him specifically explain, if I may, why the amendment is not necessary, because I think I may say to the gentleman on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and others that we feel this is a very necessary amendment. If necessary, of course, we will introduce legislation early in the next year to amend the act to include it. But, at this time, before acting on any motion to accept the conference report, I think it needs to be explained why the gentleman feels the House provision is not necessary.

Mr. ELLIOTT. May I say to the gentleman that he knows, I think, and I think the majority of the Members of the House know that such language in legislation passed by the House is not necessary. We pass several hundred bills a year here, and every now and then the House selects a particular bill and attempts to add language of that kind. But, in this case it was felt by a large majority—maybe not unanimously but by a large majority—of the conferees that the language had no particular place in this bill, and we adopted the Senate language dealing with this matter

in question, and the amendment which the gentlewoman refers to is not in the bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would say to the gentleman that I feel that that is not, frankly, a satisfactory answer to the question, because obviously when the House voted for the amendment, it must have felt it was necessary or it would not have accepted the amendment.

If I remember correctly—and I ask the gentleman whether this is not correct—is not this amendment included in other acts and was it not taken from other acts specifically word for word?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Certainly in partial answer to the gentleman from California's inquiry I think I might call to his attention a letter to me dated August 19, 1958, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in response to a letter which I had written the Department requesting its comment on the amendment in question. The letter from the Department to me, reads in pertinent part as follows:

It is our belief that the quoted language is simply declaratory of the inherent meaning of other provisions of the bill. The action of the House of Representatives in adding this declaratory language to H. R. 13247 does not, in our opinion, alter the basis on which loans and fellowships would be awarded. It seems clear to us that the basis for the award of loans and fellowships would be the same without, as with, the antidiscrimination provisions.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the conferees who held out as long as I could in order to keep this amendment in the bill. I concur in what the gentleman has said that an integral part of such legislation is that there shall be no discrimination because of race, color, sex, or any other discrimination. But we felt that it would be a strong part of the bill. Yet we found that the conferees on the other side were adamant because we had assurances from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that there would be no discrimination in administration of the act; and there has been no discrimination in the administration of other acts. So that rather than lose the whole bill we accepted a compromise, as you have to accept compromises, with the other body.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I understand from what the gentleman has said that it is the understanding of the conferees that the Department is bound not to discriminate because of race, color, creed, or sex; and with that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I do not intend to object, I take this time to congratulate and to thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for the job that the House conferees have done on this bill. The House position has been sustained in most important particulars.

The gentleman who has been the architect of this measure is to be commended by the House not only for the job done in conference, but for the very fine bill which bears his name. This is unquestionably one of the landmarks in American statutory law. It may well be the greatest single achievement of the 85th Congress—a Congress which has been commended across the country for its monumental record. The gentleman from Alabama will be long remembered for his handiwork. This bill, more than any other, will meet the Communist threat. This bill means that the talent of our children will be conserved and developed. In my opinion, the course we take here is essential to the survival of democracy in the atomic age. I hope the bill will be passed and sent to the President by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], very much. And I want to take this opportunity to thank him for the great aid and assistance that he has provided leading to the passage of this bill.

The gentleman has been most helpful. He has shown himself to have a genuine and abiding interest in America's schools and in the opportunities which they provide for America's young folks. The gentleman from Oklahoma has wrought mightily, and wrought well, in aiding this bill to achieve the place which it now occupies.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama if he can explain to the House the reason for the increase in the item for research and experimentation in TV and radio from \$2 million as provided in the House bill to \$15 million.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I shall be happy to answer the gentleman's question. The House had cut very severely the estimates which had been furnished. The House said that \$8 million would be sufficient over a period of 4 years to do the job. The Senate had brought in a figure of \$35 million. After much discussion, the conference committee came to the conclusion unanimously that in order to do the job properly it might require about \$18 million over a 4-year period. That is the figure we agreed upon in the conference report.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, apparently, the needle is getting in too far and we are getting too close to the truth on this legislation to suit the proponents of an out Federal aid to education, and they have to resort to parliamentary maneuvers to shut off debate.

As I was saying before I was cut off by the quorum call, I too was extremely interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] and commend him for his forthrightness in bringing this situation into true focus. This is particularly significant viewed in the fact that he was the spokesman for 80 of his liberal Democratic colleagues on January 30, 1957, when he placed in the

RECORD the proposed program for the Democrats in the House of Representatives in the 85th Congress. Mind you, this was on January 30, 1957, before sputnik or anything else to which they attempt to tie this bill. That program set forth very definitely the position in favor of general Federal aid to education in all events.

The time-honored technique of seizing upon a situation to accomplish the purpose which they are for in any event has again been used. I regret to see that it appears that this will again be successful. My colleagues who have opposed Federal aid to education previously, but are voting for this bill, I am sure mean what they say when they refer to it as a temporary measure and insist that its scope should not be broadened. In answer to this, I merely challenge anyone to show where any program such as this has ever been undertaken by the Federal Government and has ever been discontinued.

That this is only a foot in the door and must be expanded is obvious from the infinitesimal number of people that it will assist and funds it will provide. I do not intend to review my remarks made in the Committee of the Whole when the bill was originally under discussion in the House, but I think everyone realizes that is the fact. This is strictly a foot-in-the-door proposition of the worst sort. It involves many things more dangerous than Federal aid to school construction. It provides for a little Federal aid to our school system, across the board—elementary, high school, and colleges. It provides for a little Federal aid for construction, for equipment, for supervision, and to the student. All of these programs will be expanded, and we know that there will be an immediate effort in that direction. With it comes all of the evils of Federal control of the school system.

The worst thing is that the technique of when a situation does not develop, you create one, has really been employed. This is given the fancy title of the National Defense Education Act, but as was so well pointed out on the floor of the House during debate, there is nothing pertaining to national defense in this act.

I quote an editorial of August 15, 1958, from the Casper Tribune-Herald, one of the fine newspapers in Wyoming:

THE WAY TO DEFICITS

The Senate has passed a broad Federal aid to education bill designed, so the news report of the action goes, to help meet the challenge flashed by Soviet scientific advances. No wonder people become confused.

Soviet scientific advances were not achieved by a newly developed crop of geniuses out of the Soviet educational system, but by older Soviet scientists, the counterparts of our own. A difficulty is that the American people are encouraged to think of Russia as backward and the Russians as incompetent—and this country, somehow, superior in everything.

It is the lot of no nation to outperform all others in all things, and it might be well to adjust to the fact before, say, the Chinese come up with a real shocker.

Still, aid to education rides the propaganda line. In Senate-approved form it represents a new cost to taxpayers of \$1.3 billion; or converted into deficit and debt, as it will be,

a cumulative cost much greater. The House scaled its own bill to something more than \$900 million by eliminating Federal scholarships.

The Senate holds to scholarships, all 23,000 of them, in the fields of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. The latter crept in as an afterthought, possibly because Government found too many of the representatives it sent abroad unable to speak the languages of the countries to which they were sent.

However, the Senate made a concession, against stiff opposition, in that it scaled the value of scholarships to \$250 a year and authorized loans of up to \$750 a year to needy scholarship winners.

Opponents argued that reducing the amount of the scholarships would defeat the purpose of encouraging students to study harder and take tougher courses. If that seems to make educational incentive a matter of subsidy rather than opportunity, the idea is no more crackpot than that basic to the aid bill itself.

For that matter, Senator PAT McNAMARA of Michigan fairly well spelled out the situation with an amendment that would have added a \$2 billion school construction program to the authorization on the ground that the scholarship-loan plan offered no help for primary and secondary schools.

The Senate shied away from the proposal primarily, it seems, because it opened the way to a school integration fight with attempts to bar Federal funds from segregated schools, a sure kiss of death.

As matters stand, the Senate passed its bill by overwhelming majority—nearly 2½ to 1—and a new Federal aid venture is assured on the scale of a billion dollars that Government doesn't have and can't get, and indeed, doesn't dare to ask.

Here is fiscal irresponsibility at its worst.

Mr. Speaker, some good things which I would like to support are included in this bill. There are separate bills pending on them before this body. If this conference report, which I am going to vote against, is voted down, they can be passed and will have my full support. I particularly refer to vocational education.

If this bill passes, it will be a great victory for those who are in favor of Federal support of our schools and Federal control of our schools, but it will be indeed a dark day for America and for American education.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, if I understood the gentleman from Alabama correctly, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare claims there has been no discrimination; is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That sums up what was said about it. As the gentleman knows, this is not a new program. This procedure, as the gentleman well knows, is not new. There are many other programs now being carried on of like character. There is the program under Public Laws 815 and 874. May I say that we held long hearing on this matter, and so far as it was brought to our attention, there was no evidence of any discrimination with respect to the handling of those programs.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement, because the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and others who have questioned the gentleman on this subject should be aware now that there is no intention next year to provide antidiscriminatory legislation.

I think the point ought to be made clear and complete at this time, that in voting for the conference report you are voting for a bill without any antidiscrimination provisions; you will be voting for a bill on which the House conferees have retreated completely on the issue of discrimination. Furthermore, you will be voting for a law in which, according to the interpretation of the gentleman from Alabama, there will be full and complete integration as provided by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Thus any college practicing segregation would not be eligible to participate.

Mr. DIXON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the conference committee took all the scholarships out of the bill; is that not right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct. May I say to the gentleman from Utah we brought back exactly what the House passed in that respect except for three changes. Those three changes are these:

We lowered the interest rate from 4 percent to 3 percent.

Secondly, we provide in the case of people who teach that if they teach 5 years one-half of their loans will be forgiven. That provision was not in the House bill but it was in the Senate bill. Upon discussion we came to the conclusion in the light of the use of that provision by 11 States that it was perhaps a good provision and one that we could try out for a period of 4 years.

Mr. DIXON. That will help us to recruit the best scholars for our depleted teaching staff. It also will induce students to teach, so they serve the country just the same as ROTC students who get aid, or those who go to Annapolis or West Point. Is not that true?

Mr. ELLIOTT. We thought it would be a good trial run, so to speak, to try to get some of the additional teachers that the country so badly needs at this time. Let me say to my friend, may we proceed with the consideration of the conference report and continue our discussion after the statement is read?

Mr. DIXON. I just want to say that I think that the cancellation of 10 percent of the loan each year for the first 5 years in which the recipient of the loan teaches is a magnificent addition to our bill. The committee did a splendid job in preserving the House bill almost intact in making junior colleges eligible, in appropriating \$20 million a year for area vocational schools, in making loans interest free until 1 year after graduation, and in eliminating the 23,000 scholarships from the Senate version.

At long last we are beginning to quit grumbling about our schools and to give them help that is long overdue. It is better to light a candle than to curse in the darkness. August 23 (today) will go down in history as the beginning of a new educational awakening in America.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman has been most helpful in working out this legislation. His knowledge and experience; his suggestions, his friendliness at each step of the way have been inspiring and

helpful. The gentleman came to the House of Representatives as a great educator. Here he has proven himself a statesman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that the statement be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 21, 1958.)

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say to the House that we brought back, with some very important amendments the House bill. We maintained the position of the House with reference to the loan provisions of this bill. The House, by its action, had given the conferees a mandate to bring back a loan program instead of a scholarship program or, to say it another way, the House insisted that our scholarships be made loans. We maintained that position.

We did make moneywise two large additions to the bill. One was in the field of vocational education. The Senate had a provision for some aid to area vocational schools.

We brought back, Mr. Speaker, a bill that had \$60 million for area vocational schools. That \$60 million is for aid to our area vocational schools so that they may train highly skilled technical people in this field. I would like to say this. After discussing this matter in four long conferences, the conference committee came to the conclusion that something should be done in that field. We did not accept the Senate provision outright, but instead we made the amount involved \$15 million a year for 4 years. It is a fine addition to our bill. Our vocational education people are doing an excellent job. They have enough know-how and experience in this field to do a good job with this money. I know they will.

I received a telegram just this morning from Mr. Carlton Kelly, head of the trade school at Decatur, Ala. It is a school of the type that this bill is designed to aid. That telegram told me that school had already trained 850 people who were doing highly skilled technical work on the Jupiter missile at the Redstone Arsenal in the district of the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. JONES, and it further said that that particular school needed a great deal more money to equip itself to do most effectively that kind of work. We also have a quotation from one of the people most interested in this matter saying that our vocational schools in this highly technical age must be shored up with better equipment in order to do the job of training technologists below the engineering grade. Well, this is an item that cost \$60 million and which added \$60 million to our bill.

We also added \$40 million, or rather \$10 million a year for 4 years, to our equipment title, with the result that we have for allocation to the States \$70 million a year for equipment in this bill. This money will, of course, be matched by the States.

We accepted the Senate provisions, as I pointed out a little while ago, with ref-

erence to experimentation in the field of television and educational films as a teaching aid. We also added another \$10 million to the bill.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of the House that the only significant change we made in the loan title was to provide the forgiveness feature which I have mentioned, and to provide for lowering the interest from 4 percent to 3 percent, and to reduce the college contributions to the loan funds from 20 percent, as provided in the House bill, to 10 percent.

The Senate bill had no provision for matching of the loan funds. We felt that the matching was an important element in the program. We insisted that some matching be provided. The 10-percent agreement was the result.

We provided for more flexibility in the repayment terms in connection with the loan program. We provided for postponement of payments on the loans for up to a period of 3 years to cover military service of the person who may have the loan.

Those were the principal changes made.

Something was said in the debate the other day that in the opinion of some of the Members, this bill was not closely enough tied to our national defense. I may say we added an amendment to the loan provision which reads like this and which ties it to the national defense. I deem, as closely as we can reasonably afford to tie a loan provision of this kind. I quote now from the bill:

In the selection of students to receive the loans, special consideration shall be given to (a) students with a superior academic background, who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (b) students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman and to remind the House once more that this legislation is the product of almost innumerable formal hearings—absolutely innumerable informal hearings. More than 200 witnesses were heard. Personally, I think that without the patience and the understanding and complete knowledge that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has, we would not have the opportunity to have this great legislation before us.

I subscribe to it almost thoroughly. I regret, however, that in the section which the gentleman just mentioned there is such undue emphasis, in my opinion, on mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages, for I believe very strongly that the humanities are every bit as important to the national defense as are these specific subjects. This does not mean that the issue had not been discussed fully in the subcommittee and again in the full committee and in the debate. However, I consider that it is regrettable, even though supportable as a national defense measure, that this emphasis is here. I do, not

know how many physicists it would take to understand as much about the mind of Mr. Khrushchev, for instance, as would a student of Russian language and Russian history. We have in a sense departed from the concept of education. I recognize, however, that despite this emphasis we do have shortages in this field which we know of positively, and that we do need that emphasis to some degree on science, mathematics and modern foreign languages. I hope at some time, in the wisdom of this body, in the future that this emphasis will no longer be necessary. Through this bill there is an emphasis which runs through the entire measure. There are national defense issues. After all, this is a national defense act. It is predicated on a known need. But there are special considerations given all the way through the act to equipment, to teaching, and to institutions and other matters relating directly to the emphasis, which the gentleman has referred to, and to which I have rather serious reservations. Notwithstanding those reservations, this is magnificent and historic legislation.

I might remind the House that this is the first time in 90 years since the Morrill Act, that a bill has undertaken broad assistance to education. It is not the fault of the gentleman from Alabama that this was not done 10 years ago. If he had been listened to then as he is being listened to today, perhaps we would not need the emphasis which I find slightly distasteful.

The gentleman has done nothing short of magnificent service in sending to the Members of this body and the other body and to the youngsters who are about to enter college this legislation. I cannot commend him too highly for it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I realize what the gentleman's position is. I will say that as a member of the subcommittee studying this matter, and as a member of the full Committee on Education and Labor, he has been most helpful and diligent in getting this bill to the floor of the House in such a form that it is receiving the general acceptance which it has had.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to preface my question by joining in the universal tributes that have been paid today and before to the gentleman for his work on this legislation, which I think in the years to come will be recognized as a landmark in the development and strength of our country so that it can meet all requirements.

I would like for the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill to explain the graduate fellowship section which is carried in the bill and which developed from the conference. I understand the gentleman made some reference to it a minute ago, but I would like to have it explained in more detail.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think one of the finest parts of the bill is the title providing 5,500 fellowships over a period of 4 years

to be awarded to people who are working for a doctor's degree with preference given to those who intend to teach in the colleges of the country. It is a very fine program and it is predicated also, may I say to my friend from Mississippi, upon an expansion of existing facilities for graduate instruction. When we pass this bill we can be assured that if these fellowships are used, existing graduate facilities all over the country will have to be expanded at least sufficiently to take care of these fellowships.

And, Mr. Speaker, may I take this occasion to express to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] my sincere appreciation for the kind interest which he has shown in perfecting this bill, and especially with respect to the graduate title about which he has just inquired.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. Is the State of Indiana included or excluded?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is absolutely included just like all the other States.

Mr. DENTON. I am very much pleased, because when the other body had offered an amendment excluding Indiana I was deluged with telegrams from educators, parent-teachers associations, and many citizens. The newspapers were full of letters to the editor all to the same effect: Why should Indiana paying the same amount of taxes as any other State be excluded from the operation of this bill?

I am glad Indiana is being treated the same as the other States of the union. If this bill passes I hope the State of Indiana will cooperate to see that our citizens get the benefit of the legislation.

In conclusion I want to congratulate the subcommittee and the full committee for the work they have done on this bill. I think this will turn out to be the most important legislation probably enacted in this Congress. I think we can all be proud of it if this legislation becomes law.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], and am very happy, as I am sure are the members of the full Committee on Education and Labor with his prediction that this legislation will prove to be most important and significant in its results.

I share with him and with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], great pride in the fact that the first amendment which the House conferees agreed to was an amendment to provide the full benefits of this bill to Indiana. Both gentlemen had been most solicitous that Indiana be restored, insofar as this bill is concerned, into full and complete equality of consideration with the other States.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill we have been working on for a long time, recommended by the subcommittee and the full committee and also by the Commissioner of Education. I want to congratulate the committee on the bill

they reported out. It is a good, fair compromise and a bill which in my judgment makes a notable step in increasing educational opportunities and facilities to the youth of America.

While I cannot say exactly how the White House feels about this conference bill, I am sure it will meet with approval because it must be recognized as a forward step and one that the American people will be very much gratified we took. It will materially aid in making our country a better educated Nation and will provide great opportunities for many of our young people who otherwise do not have the price of education.

I commend the gentleman from Alabama for the fine work he has done on this legislation. His committee and he himself have worked without concern for politics but for the purpose of making a better America. I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the definition of "institution of higher education" are business colleges included, such a business college, for instance, as issue degrees, or certificates upon completion of 1, 2, 3, or 4 years of study?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Does the gentleman mean nonprofit business colleges?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is within the definition, if the gentleman will read the report, an inclusion of certain business schools provided they meet the requirements set out in the report. Those requirements would have to be measured as against any specific situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. While my question was directed to nonprofit business colleges, would a college that is operating for profit be eligible to obtain loans and to make loans to students who might attend that school?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It would not, I believe, if it were the ordinary case. The business schools were most aggressive in representing their interests in this matter. Their representatives presented testimony before the subcommittee, and they were heard with interest.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to clarify the point raised by the gentleman from Colorado. There are about seven schools, degree-granting institutions that carry on a special course in business administration, accounting, and so forth, that might possibly qualify under this bill. But the ordinary independent business school that does not grant degrees will not participate.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is it not true a part of the duty and responsibility of the State commissioner of education is to determine who is eligible and who is not, or is that all done by the United States Commissioner of Education?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say with respect to the business schools—I have not been able to find the exact page in the report here—the report sets out five specific requirements.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I cannot find the precise spot either, but the requirements are that the work given at those institutions must lead to a baccalaureate degree.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. They must be nonprofit institutions, which would include business colleges, any college or university, but not some 90 percent of them which do not give baccalaureate degrees, and which do not operate on a nonprofit basis.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The criteria are the profitmaking and the degrees.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I take it that any school that is operating for profit cannot under any circumstances obtain a grant from the Commissioner of the State and from the Department here in Washington?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is my understanding.

Mr. ELLIOTT. May I refer the gentleman to page 4 of the conference report, paragraph (b), which sets out the five qualifications that a business school must have in order to qualify.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion as a great day in the House of Congress when we are taking this far-reaching step in thinking about education in this great country of ours. As one who introduced the President's bill, the administration bill, it is a great pleasure for me to tell this body that 80 percent of the content of that bill is included in the bill which we brought back in conference. Then, too, I want to congratulate the Committee on Education and Labor, after receiving many slaps in the face at times, as being very forward in living up to its obligation under the chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. I do not think any Member of this body can go out and make any political claims on this bill. It was done in the best judgment of the committee, Mr. Speaker. All of the members of the subcommittee rallied to the occasion. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], and also to send word over to the White House that we have the best bill we can get and we are sending it to the President of the United States for approval.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman.

May I say that one of the most important things about this bill, the thing that will make it strong, and give it a chance to work with good success has

been the fact it grew up so largely with bipartisan or nonpartisan support on both sides of the aisle. As the gentleman has just stated, there was nothing partisan in the handling of the bill in the subcommittee or in the Committee on Education and Labor, and I certainly hope there will not be on the floor of the House.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I would like to add my bit and say a nice word to the members of the conference who came out with a rather fine bill. As a new Member, I gained a new respect for the Congress and Congressmen and Congresswomen. Like many others, I did not know too much about the committee system of operation. I have great respect for it and I feel that a great many more Americans ought to know the amount of work that has to be put into legislation before it is ready for final action.

I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the committee who have worked so hard, because this is a new departure in governmental operations.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has made a great record here in his first term and who has contributed much to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few minutes to cover a phase of this program that to my mind is of very great importance.

Without taking away from the need for the scientists, grammarians and linguists as well as mathematicians, I believe we must expand our facilities for the trades and crafts that make the actual building and construction of our defenses possible.

With this in mind I want to join in the support of the conference report 2688 on the scholarship-aid bill. This bill was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor on which I am privileged to serve.

It was reported unanimously and I sincerely believe we can vote on this conference report in the affirmative today.

It is gratifying to know that the conferees have included vocational education. The importance of vocational education covers in part the following necessary fields of endeavor:

First. Automotive trades. America's economy depends upon its transportation system. The modern auto mechanic is a technician who keeps the wheels turning and understands the operation and maintenance of motor vehicles of all types.

Second. Brick masonry. In a day of cement and glass blocks, quick-rising housing developments, and industrial projects, the brickmason must combine manipulative skill with sound judgment and related technical information.

Third. Cabinet and pattern making. The cabinetmaker combines skill and precision to turn out articles of furniture that reflect artistry by their beauty of line and perfection of handiwork. The pattern maker's product is the link

between the designer and the casting. He is an artisan whose work requires the knowledge of several trades—woodworking, foundry methods, and machine-shop practice.

Fourth. Carpentry. Carpenters are builders; theirs is the responsibility of making the architect's design a reality. Perfection of construction will mean increased enjoyment for those who work or dwell within the walls of the structure. It may mean the start of a new kind of living.

Fifth. Drafting. Suspension bridges that leap rivers, skyscrapers that rise to city skylines, and the turbine that throbs with power were first put onto paper by the draftsman with fine penciled lines. Whether it be dramatic designs for industry or functional patterns for modern living, the draftsman's design furnished the blueprint for production.

Sixth. Electricity. Electricity lights the world, moves power machines, and transmits voices and pictures through the medium of telephone, radio, and television. Technicians in the field of electricity hold within their knowledge one of the most powerful and useful discoveries of mankind.

Seventh. Machine-shop practice. Mass production, mechanization, and automation are prime factors in our high standard of living. The machinist and the tool and die maker, working to tolerances of one ten-thousandths of an inch, play a vital role in all of America's industrial progress.

Eighth. Printing. When John Gutenberg invented movable type he opened the doors of learning to each individual. With the printed word has come the ability to transmit the knowledge of the world to each generation.

Ninth. Welding. The electric arc and the acetylene flame in the deft hands of the skilled welder join two pieces of metal as one. Welding a broken machine casting, the structural steel skeleton of a ship or skyscraper, and a network of pipelines across the country make possible many of our technological achievements.

This is a convincing and compelling list of needed jobs to be performed in our economy. While it is true that we need higher education, there is just as important a reason for having vocational education.

Without the skilled tradesmen, our economy cannot exist. Many of our skilled technicians are the graduates of private and public vocational schools.

The old days of the apprentice tradesman are fast disappearing and nothing can take the place of this program except a Government aided program for vocational education.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects at this time to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, the gentleman from Alabama, whose unselfish and understanding character has made passage of this act possible.

His calm and sober judgment of both men and issues saved this bill on many occasions when tempers and disagree-

ments threatened to bury the bill in committee.

Every member of the Committee of Labor and Education, I am sure, believes as I do; that without CARL ELLIOTT's positive hand and patient leadership this great step forward in the field of education would have died aborning.

I consider it a privilege to have been permitted to help work out the details and to have served with Mr. ELLIOTT and the whole Committee on Education and Labor.

Another great force that was added to the unselfish group working for the passage of this bill was the NEA and all of its officers and members.

From the beginning they contributed at every turn, with their statistical facts and wealth of logic and knowledge in the field of education.

We know this is a beginning and that the future will bring greater strides in our never ending search for higher education.

The following statement by the NEA is worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A STATEMENT FROM THE NEA TO REPRESENTATIVE DENT OF PENNSYLVANIA

With the report of the conferees at hand, it now seems likely that the National Defense Education Act of 1958 will become law.

It may be helpful for us to recall that things began to happen early in July when 6,000 teachers and administrators who were delegates to the NEA's annual convention voted unanimously to push this bill when it became apparent that chances were dim for the more comprehensive Murray-Metcalf bill involving Federal funds for school construction and teachers' salaries.

The immediate NEA push for the bill goes back to a late session speech by former NEA president John Lester Buford at the NEA convention in Cleveland. "Time is running out," he said. "The future of our country will be won or lost in the classrooms. Anything which is more important to the perpetuation of democracy than is education should take precedence over it. Anything less important should follow it."

As the convention gave Dr. Buford a standing ovation, another former NEA president, Cora Mowrey, introduced a resolution, calling on NEA members everywhere to launch an all-out campaign to pass a Federal support to education bill. In State after State, delegation leaders jumped to their feet to second the resolution.

I find myself in substantial agreement with majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON who said, during Senate debate on the bill, "I hope this bill is only the forerunner of better things to come * * * I know of nothing which has higher priority than the education of our children and their preparation for the needs of the modern world."

Similarly, I agree with one of my colleagues who said that it was "the work of the National Education Association and the many expressions of support from teachers all over the country which helped to get this bill off the ground."

Dr. J. L. McCaskill, executive secretary of the NEA legislative commission, made a good point when he pointed out that the two Houses of Congress, by clear-cut majorities, affirmed the belief that education, "is not just an investment in people, it is an investment in the future of the United States of America. It is a vote of confidence by the Congress of the United States in the schools and teachers of the country."

As reported by the conferees, this is a good bill; it includes concessions from both sides and is a significant milestone in the history of American education and our Nation.

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will not take much of the committee's time or of the gentleman's time. But, coming as I do from a metropolitan area of some 7 million population, I just want to say that this bill is going to be tremendously helpful, and it is one of the finest pieces of legislation which this Congress has produced. And it may be the one piece of legislation which will have the most lasting effect upon the lives of these young people that will be allowed to participate. I sincerely compliment the gentleman and his committee for this fine piece of legislation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much. He is very kind and encouraging. I share with him the belief that this legislation will do much for the boys and girls of America.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. It has been a pleasure to participate in the preparation of this legislation. It so happens that the Subcommittee on General Education, of which I happen to be the chairman, was assigned, along with the special committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, in the preparation of this legislation. The gentleman from Alabama will bear me out that we spent about 5½ months in the preparation of this legislation. The bill as first presented to the subcommittee consisted of 16 titles. Today I believe it has been refined and brought down to the point where it has about 10 titles, I believe.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right. We cut off many of them and may I say it was a most delightful pleasure to work with the gentleman and with the members of his subcommittee on this legislation. We worked together long and faithfully.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, let me say this, that the part that my subcommittee had to deal with was the part affecting our elementary and secondary schools which falls under the purview of my subcommittee. One part of the bill which I think has received very little discussion this morning, and that will probably mean more to America in the matter of defense than anything else, is title IV, in which we provide Federal matching moneys to be matched by the States and the local school districts, which will provide sufficient funds during the 4-year period to rebuild every laboratory in every one of the 27,000 high schools of this Nation; not only to rebuild them but to rehabilitate existing laboratories for teaching chemistry and physics and biology and other things in which we are weak. That is, in my estimation, the most valuable part of your legislation,

may I say to the gentleman from Alabama.

Now, may I say to you that we have taken practically all of the bugs out of this legislation. It is good, wholesome, safe legislation which has as its basic objective the preservation of America and American ideals and the proper training of our boys and girls. I want to compliment the gentleman from Alabama and say to him that I was more than pleased to offer the time and the efforts that I put in in assisting in this legislation. I sincerely hope that the House will adopt this without any further debate.

Mr. ELLIOTT. May I sincerely thank my distinguished friend who served with me as cochairman of our subcommittees which worked on this legislation. Everybody in this House knows of the gentleman's deep interest in education.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I take this time to pay my respects and compliments to the gentleman with whom I differ completely on this bill, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] who spoke just a few moments ago. I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey for being frank and forthright with this House as to his views. I know that he expresses the views of a substantial element in this House and outside this Congress. He is not interested in specific specialized Federal aid to education; he is in favor of general Federal aid to education. He is not in sympathy or interested primarily in temporary Federal aid to education; he is in favor of permanent Federal aid to education. It is an excellent example of what I have been telling this House throughout the debate on this issue, and I commend him for his frankness, and I commend him for putting the House and the Congress and the President on notice as to what may be expected. In other words, the supporters of this legislation are indicating their determination to play with the fire of massive transfer of support of education by the Federal Government, but so far as I am concerned, there is no demonstrated evidence that there is any capacity to control that fire once they start play with it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] is substantially correct in his analysis of my feelings. However, I would say further that there is something which I consider equally important which was not adopted this year, and that is Federal aid for classroom construction.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Is that for next year?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman did not say anything about the imperative need for this legislation which I emphasized in my earlier remarks.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of this committee for the great work he has done. I, too, was very much interested in the progress of science in America. Before sputnik I introduced a bill along these lines. I am certainly glad that they have brought in this kind of legislation. This bill takes care of various points that are so necessary in order to bring American standards up in the field of science.

(Mr. HOLLAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has been most interested in the subject matter of this legislation, and has brought the results of his individual research and of his broad knowledge in the field to the attention of the subcommittee in a most thorough and helpful way.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to my distinguished colleague and friend from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a speech. I simply want to say, as one Alabamian to another that I am very proud of the bill and the good record my esteemed colleague has made. I should like to point out for the RECORD that the chairman of the committee who handled this bill in the other body happens to be another esteemed and distinguished Alabamian. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and the members of his committee on what I think will be one of the outstanding pieces of legislation of this whole session. I should like to say further that it must give a really good feeling to get a bill passed.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much. His interest in this legislation and his encouragement have been most helpful and are deeply appreciated.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The gentleman already knows of my support of this legislation. I want to refer specifically to the scholarships at the graduate level.

Mr. ELLIOTT. We call them fellowships.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Fellowships; it is my understanding that if a graduate student is going to continue teaching his application is given priority; is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does it matter in which field he decides he is going to teach?

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is no restriction with respect to that.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his interest and support.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman inform the House what is the estimated annual cost of this bill under the conference report?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The estimated cost for 4 years is \$887 million of which I think \$266 million will be paid back. That would make the cost approximately \$621 million.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand it, the estimated annual cost is approximately \$165 million?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I figure it at \$155½ million; I think that is about correct, after giving credit for the moneys to be repaid.

Mr. CRAMER. Of this amount under title I, this having been considered as a bill involving scholarship loans, as I understand it approximately \$45 million is for that purpose out of the approximate \$150 million, is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Forty-seven and one-half million dollars, I will say to the gentleman, is the cost of the loan provision for the first year.

Mr. CRAMER. The thing that disturbs me, and I wish the gentleman could satisfy my concern about it, is this. I introduced a loan scholarship bill myself, although I prefer a guaranteed loan program, frankly. Why is this bill so overbalanced so that under the program less than one-third of the money goes into what the bill is supposed to accomplish, scholarships for these students on a loan basis in order that they may better equip themselves supposedly to serve defense purposes? Two-thirds of the money does not go into this program at all, so far as scholarships are concerned.

That was the fundamental program in which the administration was interested and that is the program in which I am interested. It is this additional \$100 million that is going into other fringe aspects that disturbs me.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I believe the administration's bill covered all these other aspects mentioned except vocational education.

Mr. CRAMER. Can the gentleman advise us as to the thinking of his committee concerning these aspects other than the scholarship and loan program?

Mr. ELLIOTT. We felt that when we looked at the whole broad spectrum of education we could most cheaply and most quickly do the most good by attacking existing problems at these points, namely, the loans which the gentleman has mentioned and for which there is some \$300 million, the fellowships, for which there is \$82,500,000, the equipment for which there is \$280 mil-

lion. With respect to equipment may I say it was the desire of the committee to do something down in the grades so as to start this process of training people in the sciences and technologies; there is a real good reason for each title in the bill.

I will say to the gentleman that I feel really, truly, and strongly that each of these titles has its place in this bill and will serve a very worthy purpose in doing what we want to do for America, namely, to answer the Soviet threat to gain supremacy over us in science.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman, and I want to serve that objective, but will the gentleman give some assurance to the House that by voting for this conference report we are not leading up to a program of classroom construction next session?

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is no connection between the items in this bill and classroom construction, none whatsoever. There is no construction authorized in this bill except some very minor remodeling for the placing of equipment, in other words, moving a door, making a hole in a wall to get laboratory equipment in, and things of that sort. What the future may hold with respect to proposals for school construction, I will say to the gentleman, I know no more than he.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a good many Members have asked me whether I feel this conference report retain the essential features of the amendment I offered and which was adopted by the House when we were considering this bill.

Let me say right at the outset that it does. I think the House conferees did do an extraordinarily good job, and I commend them for it, beginning of course, with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the House conferees, of whom I am one, felt that in the face of the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota we had to insist on taking scholarships out of the conference report.

Mr. JUDD. I greatly appreciate that fact—and I have been most grateful when several of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor, of both parties, tell me that even though they opposed my amendment in defending their committee bill, they personally believed my amendment makes it a better bill.

Naturally, no two persons will agree as to the merits of all of the titles of so comprehensive a bill. I have grave doubts about the wisdom and effectiveness of some of them, and I am sure some of the conferees also have qualms about some of them. There are potential dangers in some of the provisions.

On the other hand, look at the dangers we face in going on as we have been—slowly falling behind. We have to weigh the possible dangers in passing this bill against the undeniable shortcomings and inadequacies in the field of education that will continue if we do nothing.

The scholarship title, to which there was the greatest objection, is not in the conference report. That means that all the assistance provided in the bill is available to students on the same basis namely, as loans. We will not have the situation where one student with a free grant will be working alongside another student just as able and in just as great need, but who has had to take a loan and will repay it. Furthermore, elimination of title II avoids the setting up of a whole new mechanism of commissions which, outside the college themselves that know the students best, would pass upon the applications for scholarships on the basis of the results of tests and also, inevitably, of pressures from friends of the applicants, and so on.

It is the colleges that are the most interested in their students, are closest to them, and have the most professional skill in evaluating them, they should be the ones to select the students to receive the loans.

One of the objections raised by those who opposed the elimination of the scholarship title was their belief that this bill should have prizes and rewards in it in order to provide an additional incentive to students to get them to want to go to college and to develop their capacities to the utmost, and especially to take the tough courses in science, mathematics, and so on. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have done a splendid job in transferring this incentive element to the loan provision. I am grateful that they adopted my suggestion that in the selection of individuals to whom loans are to be given, special consideration should be given to superior students who have demonstrated that they have special aptitudes or preparation in the fields of science, engineering, mathematics, and languages. Of course, it cannot and should not be an ironclad rule; but this provision does offer a real incentive to our boys and girls to work hard in high school. They will know that the best assurance they will have a chance to get loans on easy terms to enable them to go to college and get the best possible education, is the record they make and the capacities they demonstrate in high school.

Furthermore, I think the conferees have improved the House bill by the provision which will increase the incentive for more and more qualified individuals to go into teaching, through authorizing cancellation of the loan at the rate of 10 percent a year that they spend in teaching, up to 5 years. Some have expressed a fear that this is an indirect way of keeping the free-scholarship idea; that it will give a scholarship character to the loan title. I do not agree with that view. When a scholarship is given to an individual, that is the end of it. He has no obligations to make a particular return to the Government or to edu-

cation or to society. But a loan can be canceled, up to half of it, only in return for value received. There is a quid pro quo. It gives a student an additional incentive to go into the all-important field of teaching, when he knows that he can reduce by a half the amount that he has to pay back by teaching for 5 years. By that time he is more likely to stay in teaching.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this conference report makes sure that no qualified American boy or girl will be denied a college education for lack of funds. Secondly, not one boy or girl who would have had educational opportunity under the original bill will be denied that opportunity under the provisions of this report. In fact, a larger number of deserving and needy youth will have that opportunity under this report because as the loans are paid back the money can be used over again for the younger brothers or for the qualified among neighbor's children.

So, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this report. I do not expect that it will prove to be perfect—I am sure that some bugs will be found in it. Some of the nine titles will not work as well as others. Some may prove unsound or ineffective. We will have to deal with such a situation if and when we come to it. But, on the whole, this is really a monumental piece of legislation. It unquestionably represents a landmark in the history of American education. I hope it will prove of very great benefit to our country at this time in our history and I vote for it in that faith.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL].

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full time allotted to me, but I would like to say yesterday morning there was a conference with the President and Dr. Killian. The President was very enthusiastic about this measure as it finally came out of conference. It was a privilege for me to have served as one of the conferees. This was my first opportunity to serve on a conference committee and so my judgment may not be as good as some of its old hands, but I feel that the House prevailed. I think it prevailed in almost every instance with possibly two changes which I believe have been explained to you here today. One change was in the provision where the teachers have the opportunity to have forgiveness of up to 50 percent of their loan. This hits at the heart of our problem here in the United States. We lack teachers not only in quantity but we lack teachers in quality. This provision goes importantly to that problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close the debate with just a few reminders. The Soviet Union today has one of the most dangerous weapons in the whole world—the atheistic, scientific trained mind—and it has them in plentiful supply. If the United States is to compete with the Soviet Union, we have to do a better job than we are doing now. The Soviet colleges and universities graduated twice as many engineers and scientists as we did in 1956.

They have more than double the number of science students in their higher educational institutions this year than we have.

Tuition in colleges is free—they pay students salaries—(stipends they have named them)—there are bonuses in addition for those with high scholastic marks, particularly in science.

But it is what Russia is doing at the secondary school level (where every nation should spawn its future scientists) that Russia becomes the greatest threat to America and the West.

Their accent on education filters through to the lowest base, their 10-year secondary school, it is perhaps the toughest grammar school and high school system in the world.

And that is where they are now establishing a lead over the United States that is going to take an almost superhuman effort for us to overcome.

History teaches that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. It occurs to me that it might be that the battle for survival for the West might be lost in the schools of America.

The Communists' whole educational system is intensely competitive and the idea of a classless society is wiped out immediately when one begins to fathom what goes on inside the U. S. S. R.

These youngsters, between the ages 7 to 17, go to classes 6 days a week, nearly 10 months a year. Homework varies from 2½ to 6 hours per day.

School attendance through these ages is now mandatory in most urban centers, and they hope to widen compulsory 10-year schooling in rural areas by 1960. Schools in most agricultural sections stop at the 7th grade, which is high school freshman year in our system.

The comparison of what we are not doing in America in the field of science and mathematics education at the high school level is not merely serious, but shocking.

I, too, am stunned by figures produced by the United States Office of Education and by studies made by the National Science Foundation on the precipitant decline percentagewise in high school instruction in mathematics and science.

These subjects are electives in most United States high schools.

There are no electives in the Soviet 10-year schools.

Twenty four percent of our high schools offer no geometry. Twenty three percent of our high schools offer no physics or chemistry.

In 1900, algebra was studied by 56 percent of high-school students. In 1955, the figure was less than 25 percent.

Twenty seven percent of our public high-school students carried geometry in 1900. In 1955, only 11 percent.

The number of pupils taking geometry has declined in the past 20 years although student population has increased.

In physics the figure dropped from 19 percent in 1900 to 4 percent in 1953.

Is it a small wonder, then, that we graduated only 228 new physics teachers in 1956 to staff our 28,000 high schools? And while we graduated 2,121 general science teachers this same year—many

of whom had majors in physics—the total production of physics teachers fell woefully short of the necessary goal.

And a large number of these never entered the teaching profession. They joined the growing ranks of science teachers who have heeded the better-paid calling of industry and Government.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, provided the means that makes this bill most acceptable to all of us. He recognized the need of the students who would qualify because of need; not because of a scholarship. I think the House and the Congress and the conferees have recognized the wisdom of the Judd amendment and have adopted it, and it makes the bill much more acceptable to us than it was otherwise.

Another point that I think is very important. The declared policy of Congress repeated in the conference report and I quote "that the Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over the primary responsibility for public education" end of quote, which I think is vitally important. If we do not adhere to this policy declared in this conference report in all future legislation on education, we will be promoting a socialistic form of education under Federal control which we do not want in this country. I compliment the conferees for including that declared policy of Congress in their report. As a member of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration I found during the hearings that if we did not provide some help to needy students who are qualified to pursue scientific courses we would not be able to compete with Russia in the production of engineers, chemists, biologists and in many other sciences.

In response to a questionnaire to the people of my district I received 67 percent "yes" to 33 percent "no" for Federal aid for students to pursue a scientific course.

I favor the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut who has done such a fine job on this bill. He was key man in the development of the loan provision, the most important section of this bill. He worked tirelessly to work his will, and the legislation has been greatly improved as a result.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to join in commending the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. ELLIOTT] and the House conferees for the excellent job they did in bringing out a bill which on the whole is very acceptable. I would like to ask the gentleman to confirm my understanding, that the conferees retained an amendment that was adopted, including junior colleges in the section which deals with science.

Mr. HASKELL. They were included by the gentleman and, of course, the one who made this possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Delaware has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I notice there are funds made available for facilities in various schools. The gentleman from Michigan asked about the junior colleges. I would like to ask the gentleman from Delaware whether any funds are authorized for school facilities such as laboratories and science equipment for private and parochial schools in this bill?

Mr. HASKELL. No. That is only through a loan.

Mr. LAIRD. But none of the grant funds authorized in this legislation are available to any private and parochial schools?

Mr. HASKELL. No.

Mr. LAIRD. Did the conferees give consideration to grants for private and parochial schools in view of security or defense needs of our Nation?

Mr. HASKELL. Yes, they did.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. A few years ago a committee investigated tax-exempt foundations. We found definitely that the powerful influence of a few large tax-exempt foundations had been to a large measure responsible for the swing in public schools and colleges away from pure science into the area of social science.

Now, in reviewing, there are 10 tax-exempt foundations that have an annual income of something more than a billion dollars a year. But a small percentage of that income is given for scholarships in the field of pure science about which we are concerned today. I was wondering if this committee gave consideration to some means of trying to influence the tax-exempt foundations to give more scholarships in the field of pure science rather than continuing their emphasis on the social sciences.

Mr. HASKELL. We did not feel that this should be a part of our work on this legislation.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. They have available for the very purpose we seek to accomplish in this bill more money than the Federal Government is making available. I think it would be very helpful if the foundations would make that money available for the inducement of students to take training in pure science.

Mr. HASKELL. I wish finally to congratulate the subcommittee, the full committee, and the conferees. They have done a magnificent job in bringing this legislation to passage after a year and a half of the hardest kind of work. I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] beyond anybody else deserves a tremendous amount of credit for this legislation. It was a magnificent job well done.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much. It has been a pleasure to work with the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL] on this worthwhile legislation. He has been most diligent and cooperative throughout the long committee hearings, and throughout the conference. He has been most helpful in pursuing a bipartisan or nonpartisan approach on this bill. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON]. I could not help but recall that it was in January of 1957, long before sputnik the first, that the same gentleman published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Democratic legislative program for 1957.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the national defense education bills of 1958 and to praise the outstanding leadership of my distinguished colleague from Alabama, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, for his untiring efforts as chairman of the Labor and Education Subcommittee in bringing this bill to the House floor.

For a long period of time the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has labored through study and research to make this bill possible for our final consideration here today. He has been courageous, farsighted, patient, and understanding. He has been able to muster bipartisan support for this worthy and needed legislation.

The conference report on this bill is fair and meritorious. The managers on the part of the House in bringing out this conference report have done a splendid job and have brought to us a compromise bill which deserves the approval and support of the House.

I predict that the National Defense Education Act of 1958 will be regarded as one of the principal pieces of legislation that have been passed by the 85th Congress, and history will record the significance of this advanced legislative program. It will do much to afford this country an opportunity to shore up its defenses through providing technical and scientific personnel that will be required in the fast-developing defense requirements which lie ahead.

The provisions of this bill are not only clear, concise, and adequate to fulfill its mission, but are also of superior legislative quality.

For this outstanding contribution to our Nation's defense and welfare, we owe a deep debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and his subcommittee colleagues who have labored so long to make it possible for us to vote for and approve this forward-looking measure here today.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Elliott bill is a great historic occasion in the life of this legislative body, and I am confident that the renown of its author will be most pleasing and satisfying to the

citizens of Alabama as well as of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education for the great work he performed in starting America back to her leadership in science and technology.

I was also glad to see that this education bill contains a good deal of the subject matter that was in the Holland bill. I have, Mr. Speaker, long before sputnik was launched, been warning the American public that we were engaged today in a struggle that is not a mere military struggle, limited to the fields of Europe and Asia Minor, but in a military, political, economic, and technological race between the two giants of the entire world—United States and Russia. The key to that race is supremacy in scientific and technological manpower.

In 1956 I pointed this out in the Congress of the United States when I introduced H. R. 11200. The Holland bill was written after much correspondence and personal meetings with the deans of engineering schools throughout the country. Practically everything that was freely discussed at the many meetings I had with the deans is contained in this bill we are passing today.

Our first great problem was to quit wasting our precious manpower by failing to enable many bright high school students to continue to college. Many of these boys and girls could not secure the financial help to pay for their college education.

The second big problem was to get qualified teachers to teach mathematics, physics, and other kindred subjects so necessary in the science field.

My bill granted scholarships to those with ability. It also increased the salaries of the professors and teachers in amounts comparable to those paid in private industry. It encouraged graduates to go into teaching by providing them fellowships after teaching 3 years in secondary schools. It also gave appropriations for research and laboratory expansion.

I again introduced this bill in 1957, and it was considered with many others in the Subcommittee of Health and Science of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The bill that has been passed today does not give free scholarships, but does set up a loan fund so that every needy student can borrow the money on very easy terms.

\$47,500,000 will be available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; \$75 million for the year 1960; \$82,500,000 for the year 1961; \$90 million for 1962, and for other years until these students have completed their education.

They will not have to start paying it back until they are out of school over a year; however, if they will teach school for not less than 5 years, 50 percent of the loan shall be forgiven. If they wish to continue their education toward a fellowship and do graduate work for 3 years, the cost of the graduate work will be paid by the Federal Government, and the student shall receive \$2,000 for the

first year, \$2,200 for the second year, \$2,400 for the third year, plus an additional amount of \$400 each year for each dependent they may have.

Mr. Speaker, I am merely covering the science part of this bill, but there are many other items and subjects so needed to bring our educational system up to date in this automation age. This bill recognizes the need for technicians, skilled workers in the technical field, and has set up a very fine vocational education program in cooperation with the States, with the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring a scientific knowledge. It also recognizes the fact that each State shall have in their school systems guidance counseling to assist the child and to encourage able students.

Mr. Speaker, having served on the Education Committee for many years in the Senate of Pennsylvania, I am happy to be a member of the Education and Labor Committee of the Congress of the United States at the time when they recognize the need for the reforms that are in this bill, and above all, that education is a part of the defense of our country. I know that in the 30th district of Pennsylvania that I represent, we have many bright students who will avail themselves of this opportunity to secure education on a scale much higher than has been afforded in the years gone by.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the conferees on the splendid job they have done on this education bill.

However, I am disturbed about the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] in which he expressed his regrets about the emphasis on the exact sciences and what he feels to be a neglect of the so-called humanities. It seems to me this bill strikes a fairly good balance.

But the observation of the gentleman from New Jersey reflects fallacious thinking, which I fear is too widespread in this country. That is, that one can be an educated person in the complete sense without a thorough background in the basic exact sciences. I don't want to underrate the "humanities." An educated person should be familiar with all of science, the exact and the humanities.

The fortunate fact about the Founding Fathers of this great Nation was that they were educated men in the full sense of the word. They were learned in the arts, in history, in politics, and the sciences. Franklin was a practical engineer, Jefferson was an architect, Washington was a civil engineer. This more than anything else, gave them the judgment and ability to conceive a form of government and to draft a Constitution which are still the newest and most enlightened accomplishments in their field that man has ever done. It is going to take men and women of the same breadth of knowledge and understanding to preserve this Government and the Constitution against the ideologies which are nothing but dressed-up copies of that which history proves have been tried and found wanting.

I hope the passage of this bill will reawaken our people to the fact that a

knowledge of basic science is a sine qua non for the educated man.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it will be a privilege and pleasure to vote "yea" for the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Long has been the need for a shot in the arm of the educational system of this Nation. In West Virginia, as in just about every State in the Union, schools are undermanned and underdeveloped, and the net result: On graduation day our youth come up short. Long and loud has been the cry for help, and at last, yes—after being prodded and pushed—and scared, something has been done.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 gives renewed hope to the teacher, new goals to the student, and new horizons to these United States.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join in the well-deserved encomiums heaped upon the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Congressman ELLIOTT, and the members of his Subcommittee on Special Education, who handled this national defense education bill, and the membership of the House.

This is the culmination of a long and hard and sincere effort on the part of many of us to assist young and able American students attain a college education, particularly in the fields of science, engineering and mathematics. Now that this bill is about to receive final House action, we can move ahead in the field of education knowing that in the future we will no longer have to listen to statistics which show that one-half of the bright high-school students in the United States are not entering college because of lack of financial assistance.

I am particularly pleased that this national defense education bill incorporates the Federal loan feature of the bill I have been filing since coming to this House in the 83d Congress.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is said that greatness has about it the qualities of leadership, organization and the theoretical, the latter to kindle the hopes and dreams of men to overcome difficulties in which they find themselves or to help men reach the goals set by their dreams. Leadership and organization do their job when man is in abundance in fulfillment of his best wishes. Leadership, organization and the theoretical serve best when they bring out the best in man, so it seems.

This bill is a step in that direction, Mr. Speaker. All the money, all the equipment, all the teachers, classrooms, students, dormitories, textbooks, libraries, and programs will avail nothing if we lose our aim as citizens to preserve liberty and to promote prosperity for more and more people from generation to generation, so that with that liberty and with that prosperity the Creator's gifts to man for good shall flower in the joy and happiness meant for each of us in our journey through life.

And if we lose our sense of direction in these things, Mr. Speaker, we lose all.

I hope that this bill and the bills that will follow it, will allow greater and greater consideration for younger and

younger students. We seem to be stuck with the word college and the word university in a manner that would indicate youth incapable of faster growth or quicker absorption in matters of the mind, the heart, of character and good judgment.

What was college for our grandfathers could and certainly should be easier going for our children. And with more and more college trained parents around the dinner table, certainly more and more children grow and mature sooner, or should.

In the days and in the years ahead, I hope for those who legislate in these matters that more and more attention is directed at and success attained with solid assistance to the secondary schools of America; for in our secondary schools those bright virtues for betterment are established where college becomes a hope and a vivid dream for life's fulfillment and not alone a must for social standing or athletic prowess.

Our views mellow and alter with age. How touching to read recently of the grant of a million dollars by an American foundation to restore the spires of Oxford, threatened with ruin by smoke, fumes, and grime. The million dollars is a tribute to the beacon that Oxford has been for over 600 years and the contribution it has made to man's life and thought. America is young, so very young by Oxford, by European, by oriental, Asiatic, or other standards.

But when we think of the human family on earth today, we are as young as our hearts and as old as our fears, all of us, north, south, east, or west, no matter on what continent or in what hemisphere we reside. And above us? It is said there is God's plan. And that our task is rightfully to divine and to live it.

Can we learn too soon? Especially if we divine that God's plan for us is to make haste in harmony lest the disclosure of His mysteries dismay us from generation to generation?

Are the words "college" and "universities" to remain labels to blunt analysis and ready evidence of youth's faster and faster grasp and swifter appreciation of the need for betterment before war swallows youth in its maw, made bloody by ignorance, poverty, folly, and vain-glory at least once every generation since that great Man of Galilee walked this earth?

In recorded history, we are 200 generations. We have lived and recorded 4,000 years. Who is to say how soon we are to lift the lamp of learning to dispel the darkness in front of us, if any?

I trust this bill is improved year after year with a fuller flowering of assistance to our secondary schools.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 194]

Andersen, Minn.	Friedel	Matthews
Anfuso	George	Michel
Ashley	Glenn	Miller, Calif.
Auchincloss	Gordon	Miller, N. Y.
Avery	Gray	Mitchell
Barden	Green, Oreg.	Moore
Baring	Griffiths	Morrison
Bass, N. H.	Gubser	Mumma
Baumhart	Gwinn	Neal
Beamer	Hale	O'Neill
Belcher	Hardy	Osmer
Bentley	Harrison, Nebr.	Pilcher
Berry	Harvey	Powell
Betts	Healey	Preston
Blitch	Hébert	Prouty
Boykin	Henderson	Radwan
Brooks, La.	Herlong	Reed
Broomfield	Hess	Rivers
Buckley	Hill	Robeson, Va.
Burdick	Hillings	Sadlak
Christopher	Hoffman	Santangelo
Clevenger	Holtzman	Scherer
Coffin	Horan	Scott, Pa.
Collier	Hosmer	Sheehan
Colmer	Jackson	Shuford
Coudert	James	Sikes
Cunningham, Nebr.	Jenkins	Siler
Davis, Tenn.	Jennings	Smith, Kans.
Dellay	Jensen	Taylor
Derounian	Johnson, Wis.	Teague, Calif.
Dies	Kean	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Kearney	Thompson, La.
Dollinger	Keogh	Tollefson
Dooley	Kilburn	Vanik
Doyle	Landrum	Van Zandt
Durham	Latham	Vinson
Engle	LeCompte	Wainwright
Ewins	McCormack	Widnall
Farbsteln	McCulloch	Williams, N. Y.
Fino	McGregor	Willis
Fisher	McIntire	Winstead
Frelinghuysen	Macdonald	Young
	Magnuson	Zelenko
	Mason	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). On this rollcall, 301 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, before the quorum call, the gentleman from Alabama had yielded to me. Do I lose the floor because the quorum call interrupted the proceedings?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; when the previous question is ordered, the gentleman loses the floor.

(Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 123, noes 44.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One

hundred and seventy-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 212, nays 85, not voting 131, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—212

Addonizio	Garmatz	Natcher
Albert	Gary	Nix
Allen, Calif.	Granahan	Norblad
Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Norrell
Andrews	Gray	O'Brien, Ill.
Aspinall	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Ayres	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Bailey	Gregory	O'Konski
Baker	Griffin	Ostertag
Baldwin	Gubser	Patman
Barrett	Hagen	Patterson
Bass, Tenn.	Harris	Perkins
Beckworth	Haskell	Pfost
Bennett, Fla.	Hays, Ark.	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ohio	Pillion
Blatnik	Heseltun	Poage
Boland	Holifield	Polk
Bolling	Holland	Porter
Bonner	Holmes	Price
Bosch	Holt	Quie
Boyle	Huddlestone	Rabaut
Breeding	Hull	Rains
Brooks, Tex.	Hyde	Ray
Brown, Ga.	Ikard	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Mo.	Jarman	Reuss
Broyhill	Jones	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrd	Jones, Ala.	Riehlman
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Roberts
Carnahan	Judd	Robison, Ky.
Carrigg	Karsten	Rodino
Cederberg	Kearns	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Keating	Rogers, Fla.
Chamberlain	Kee	Rogers, Mass.
Chelf	Kelly, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Chenoweth	Kilday	St. George
Clark	King	Saund
Coad	Kirwan	Schenck
Cooley	Kluczynski	Schwengel
Corbett	Knox	Seely-Brown
Cramer	Knutson	Selden
Cretella	Lafore	Shelley
Cunningham, Iowa	Lane	Sieminski
Curtin	Lankford	Sisk
Curtis, Mass.	Lennon	Smith, Miss.
Curtis, Mo.	Lesinski	Spence
Dawson, Ill.	Libonati	Staggers
Dawson, Utah	Loser	Steed
Delaney	McCarthy	Sullivan
Dent	McDonough	Talle
Denton	McFall	Teller
Devereux	McGovern	Tewes
Dingell	McIntosh	Thomas
Dixon	Machrowicz	Thompson, N. J.
Donohue	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn, N. Y.	Madden	Thornberry
Dwyer	Magnuson	Trimble
Eberhart	Mahon	Udall
Edmondson	Mailliard	Ullman
Elliott	Martin	Walter
Everett	May	Watts
Fascell	Meador	Wharton
Fenton	Merrrow	Wier
Flood	Metcalf	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Calif.
Forand	Mills	Withrow
Ford	Montoya	Wolverton
Fountain	Morano	Wright
Frazier	Morgan	Yates
Fulton	Morris	Younger
	Moss	Zablocki
	Moulder	
	Multer	

NAYS—85

Abbltt	Bush	Haley
Abernethy	Byrne, Ill.	Halleck
Adair	Byrnes, Wis.	Harden
Alexander	Cannon	Harrison, Va.
Alger	Chapfield	Hemphill
Allen, Ill.	Church	Hiestand
Arends	Dague	Hoeven
Ashmore	Davis, Ga.	Johansen
Bates	Dennison	Klgore
Becker	Dorn, S. C.	Kitchin
Bolton	Dowdy	Krueger
Bow	Fallon	Lalrd
Bray	Feighan	Lipscomb
Brown, Ohio	Flynt	Mack, Wash.
Brownson	Forrester	Marshall
Budge	Gavin	Miller, Nebr.
Burleson	Gross	Minshall

Murray	Rutherford	Tuck
Nicholson	Saylor	Utt
Nimtz	Scott, N. C.	Van Pelt
O'Hara, Minn.	Sclvrner	Vorys
Passman	Scudder	Weaver
Pelly	Simpson, Ill.	Westland
Poff	Smith, Calif.	Whitener
Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Va.	Whitten
Rhodes, Ariz.	Springer	Williams, Miss.
Riley	Stauffer	Wilson, Ind.
Robison, N. Y.	Taber	
Rogers, Tex.	Thomson, Wyo.	

NOT VOTING—131

Andersen, H. Carl	Gathings	Mitchell
Anfuso	George	Moore
Ashley	Glenn	Morrison
Auchincloss	Gordon	Mumma
Avery	Griffiths	Neal
Barden	Gwinn	O'Neill
Baring	Hale	Osmer
Bass, N. H.	Hardy	Pilcher
Baumhart	Harrison, Nebr.	Powell
Beamer	Harvey	Preston
Belcher	Healey	Prouty
Bentley	Hébert	Radwan
Berry	Henderson	Reed
Betts	Herlong	Rivers
Blitch	Hess	Robeson, Va.
Boggs	Hill	Rooney
Boykin	Hillings	Sadlak
Brooks, La.	Hoffman	Santangelo
Broomfield	Holtzman	Scherer
Buckley	Horan	Scott, Pa.
Burdick	Hosmer	Sheehan
Clevenger	Jackson	Sheppard
Coffin	James	Shuford
Collier	Jenkins	Sikes
Colmer	Jennings	Siler
Coudert	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham, Nebr.	Johnson	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Kean	Taylor
Dellay	Kearney	Teague, Calif.
Derounian	Keogh	Teague, Tex.
Dies	Kilburn	Thompson, La.
Diggs	Landrum	Tollefson
Dollinger	Latham	Vanik
Dooley	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Doyle	McCormack	Vinson
Durham	McCulloch	Vursell
Engle	McGregor	Wainwright
Ewins	McIntire	Widnall
Farbsteln	McMillan	Williams, N. Y.
Fino	Macdonald	Willis
Fisher	Mason	Winstead
Frelinghuysen	Matthews	Young
Friedel	Michel	Zelenko
	Miller, Calif.	
	Miller, N. Y.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Henderson against.
Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Harvey against.
Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Beamer against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Burdick against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
Mr. Osmer for, with Mr. Clevenger against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Winstead against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Landrum against.
Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Berry against.
Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. McGregor against.
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Scherer against.
Mr. Dollinger for, with Mr. LeCompte against.

Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Gwinn against.
Mr. Bass of New Hampshire for, with Mr. Reed against.

Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Robeson of Virginia against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. James against.
Mr. Zelenko for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Willis with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Engle with Mr. George.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
 Mr. Doyle with Mr. Avery.
 Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Baumhart.
 Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.
 Mr. Farbstain with Mr. Hoffman.
 Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Horan.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Fino.
 Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Mitchell with Mr. McIntire.
 Mr. Preston with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Miller of New York.
 Mr. Johnson with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Van Zandt.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Wainwright.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Vanik with Mr. Hale.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Betts.
 Mr. Young with Mr. Hess.
 Mr. O'Neil with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Jensen.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Kilburn.
 Mr. Durham with Mr. Moore.
 Mr. Evins with Mr. Neal.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Sheehan.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Siler.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Mumma.
 Mr. Matthews with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
 Mr. Dellay with Mr. Teague of California.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Vursell.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Tollefson.
 Mr. Coffin with Mr. Belcher.
 Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Hillings.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of William Franklin Rollins;
 H. R. 1803. An act for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams;
 H. R. 4073. An act for the relief of Peter James O'Brien;

H. R. 7544. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Roger P. Ames;

H. R. 8759. An act for the relief of W. G. Hollomon and Mrs. W. G. Hollomon;

H. R. 9258. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Perreira;

H. R. 11456. An act to authorize the exchange of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex., by the United States, for other real property of equal value, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12281. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13666. An act to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 13840. An act to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institu-

tions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; and

H. J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite the countries of the free world to participate in the California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., from April 1 to 12, 1959.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 13245. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2020. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Insurance Act, and the Social Security Act; and

S. 27651. An act to provide for the promotion of certain persons who participated in the defense of the Philippines;

S. 3545. An act for the relief of John F. Sheehan; and

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Dickinson Dam in the State of North Dakota as "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1764. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 2006. An act to relieve the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy of certain responsibilities outside the Department of Defense;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the payment of bounties on dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast; and

S. 3680. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, and for other purposes.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION ACT

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 12226) to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2701)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12226) to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the language inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following: "sale of any property valued at \$500 or more shall be made only after public advertise-

ment and by sealed competitive bids or public auction: *Provided further*, That in either such case the Government of the Virgin Islands shall have the right to purchase the property at a price not greater than that offered by the highest responsible bidder and that, in the case of sales of property valued at less than \$500, it shall have a right to purchase at a price not greater than that offered by responsible prospective purchasers."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

LEO W. O'BRIEN,
 WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
 B. F. SISK,
 A. L. MILLER,
 JOHN P. SAYLOR,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
 CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
 THOMAS H. KUCHEL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12226) amending the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendments to the text of the bill:

The principal question at issue in connection with the Senate amendments to H. R. 12226 was the method of sale of assets of the Virgin Islands Corporation. The House language had left discretion to the Directors of the Corporation to use negotiated sales, competitive bidding or public auction as they saw fit. This was recommended by spokesmen for the Department of the Interior in the belief that negotiated sales frequently produce a better bargain for the Government than competitive bidding or public auction does. The Senate amendment required a public auction in all cases. Agreement was reached by the conferees that sales of assets valued at \$500 or more shall be by public auction or competitive bidding and that sales of assets valued at less than that amount may be by such method as the judgment of the Directors dictates. In either case, "fair and reasonable value" must be realized and, as provided by the Senate amendment, the Virgin Islands government will have a first refusal.

The only other matter of consequence for resolution was the Senate's insertion of an amendment explicitly referring to the use of power revenues to assist in repayment of the cost of the desalting works. The conferees have agreed to recommend omission of the amendment. It is observed that, as far as repayment is concerned, another portion of the bill requires that this be accomplished by the sale of water under contracts calling for payments sufficient to cover all operating expenses, to amortize the investment, and to pay interest thereon. The great bulk of the sale will be to the Virgin Islands government.

The other Senate amendments, to which the House conferees agreed, are perfecting in nature.

LEO W. O'BRIEN,
 WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
 B. F. SISK,
 A. L. MILLER,
 JOHN P. SAYLOR,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12226) to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat.

350) and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all legislative business and special orders heretofore entered into I may address the House for 15 minutes today and that my colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may have permission to extend their remarks following mine; further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues and myself have permission to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

GOSHEN VENEER CO.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of August 22, 1958.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this apply to only one company?

Mr. LANE. This is just the Goshen Veneer Co. The Committee on the Judiciary which passed the bill recommended the payment of \$75,000, but the Senate inserted \$295,154.47. Your committee has insisted on the \$75,000, so the Senate has agreed to that amount.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11382) to authorize the conversion or exchange,

under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, after line 15, insert:

"SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 619 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, insurance may be granted under section 602 (c) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to any individual who has had active service (as defined in such act) between October 8, 1940, and April 24, 1951, both dates inclusive, upon application made in writing within 1 year after the effective date of this act, and subject to the limitations provided in such section, and to the other provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

"(b) Notwithstanding any time limitation for filing application for insurance contained in section 620 or section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, any person heretofore eligible to apply for insurance under such sections shall, upon application made in writing within 1 year after the effective date of this act, be granted insurance thereunder, subject to the other limitations specified in such sections, except that where application for insurance under the provisions of section 621 of the act is made more than 120 days after separation from active service the applicant shall be required to submit evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of good health at the time of such application. Insurance granted pursuant to this subsection under section 621 (as amended by sections 1 and 2 of this act) shall be on the limited convertible term or permanent plans of insurance and the premiums shall be based on table X-18 and interest at the rate of 2½ percent with an additional amount for administrative costs as determined by the Administrator. The Administrator is authorized to transfer annually an amount representing such administrative cost from the revolving fund to the general fund receipts in the Treasury.

"(c) All premiums paid and other income received on account of national service life insurance granted under the authority contained in subsection (a) shall be segregated in the national service life insurance fund and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be available for the payment of liabilities under such insurance.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 606 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall determine annually the administrative costs which in his judgment are properly allocable to such insurance and shall thereupon transfer the amount of such costs from any surplus otherwise available for dividends on such insurance from the national service life insurance fund to the national service life insurance appropriation."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "3" and insert "4."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act and to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I hope the gentleman will explain the provisions of the bill. This bill is very much needed, and I wish we had the same provisions on the insurance for the servicemen of World War I.

Mr. ASPINALL. This bill was passed by the House unanimously. As passed by the House, it would permit any veteran policyholder of service between April 25, 1951, and December 31, 1956, to do three things:

First. To maintain his present term policy at the commissioners' standard ordinary premium rates.

Second. Exchange his present policy for a limited convertible term policy with lower premiums based on the new X-18 table. Such policy may not be renewed after age 50 or 2 years after the effective date of this legislation.

Third. Convert to a permanent-type policy with premiums based on the X-18 table.

May I repeat that the bill was reported out unanimously and was passed unanimously by this body. Then it went to the other body and the other body amended the bill to authorize the issuance of national service life insurance for any person who served during the period October 8, 1940, to April 24, 1951, regardless of whether or not they had ever had such insurance.

This matter, that is the amendment by the other body, has been brought before our body on various occasions heretofore and has always been rejected by us. That which is involved in the amendment should be studied by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs before it is brought up for consideration by the House. It will be studied in the future if there is any reason to study it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object. This is a very much needed bill. As I said before, I wish we had something better for those who carry World War I insurance, because it is costing them more for their premiums year after year.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if there are any extraneous amendments, in addition to that for veterans insurance?

Mr. ASPINALL. This is the only amendment.

Mr. TABER. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendments, with the following amendment: In lieu of the amendments of the Senate to the text of the bill, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following: "That effective as of January 1, 1959, section 723 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (b) is redesignated as subsection (c).

Public Law 85-864
85th Congress, H. R. 13247
September 2, 1958

AN ACT

72 Stat. 1580.

To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the "National Defense Education Act of 1958".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 101. Findings and declaration of policy.
- Sec. 102. Federal control of education prohibited.
- Sec. 103. Definitions.

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

- Sec. 201. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 202. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 203. Payment of Federal capital contributions.
- Sec. 204. Conditions of agreements.
- Sec. 205. Terms of loans.
- Sec. 206. Distributions of assets from student loan funds.
- Sec. 207. Loans to institutions.
- Sec. 208. Payments to cover reductions in amounts of loans.
- Sec. 209. Administrative provisions.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

- Sec. 301. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 302. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 303. State plans.
- Sec. 304. Payments to States.
- Sec. 305. Loans to nonprofit private schools.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

- Sec. 401. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 402. Number of fellowships.
- Sec. 403. Award of fellowships and approval of institutions.
- Sec. 404. Fellowship stipends.
- Sec. 405. Fellowship conditions.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

- Sec. 501. Appropriations authorized.
- Sec. 502. Allotments to States.
- Sec. 503. State plans.
- Sec. 504. Payments to States.

PART B—COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE TRAINING INSTITUTES

- Sec. 511. Authorization.

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

PART A—CENTERS AND RESEARCH AND STUDIES

- Sec. 601. Language and area centers.
- Sec. 602. Research and studies.
- Sec. 603. Appropriations authorized.

PART B—LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

- Sec. 611. Authorization.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION
OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL
PURPOSES

PART A—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

- Sec. 701. Functions of the Commissioner.
Sec. 702. Grants-in-aid; contracts.

PART B—DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON NEW EDUCATIONAL MEDIA

- Sec. 731. Functions of the Commissioner.

PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 761. Establishment of the advisory committee.
Sec. 762. Special personnel.
Sec. 763. Appropriations authorized.

TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

- Sec. 801. Statement of findings and purpose.
Sec. 802. Amendment to Vocational Education Act of 1946.

TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

- Sec. 901. Functions of the service.
Sec. 902. Science information council.
Sec. 903. Authority for certain grants and contracts.
Sec. 904. Appropriations authorized.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Sec. 1001. Administration.
Sec. 1002. Advisory committees.
Sec. 1003. Exemption from conflict-of-interest laws of members of advisory
committees or information council.
Sec. 1004. Administration of State plans.
Sec. 1005. Judicial review.
Sec. 1006. Method of payment.
Sec. 1007. Administrative appropriations authorized.
Sec. 1008. Allotments to Territories and possessions.
Sec. 1009. Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles. It depends as well upon the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge.

We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology.

The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense.

To meet the present educational emergency requires additional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore the purpose of this

Act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

SEC. 102. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 103. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, except that as used in sections 302 and 502, such term does not include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II, such term includes any private business school or technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(c) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(e) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the governor or by State law.

(f) The term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive, and such school-age population for the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the population between such ages for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

(g) The term "elementary school" means a school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

(h) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it

does not include any education provided beyond grade 12. For the purposes of sections 301 through 304, the term "secondary school" may include a public junior college, as determined under State law.

(i) The term "public" as applied to any school or institution does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

(j) The term "nonprofit", as applied to a school or institution, means a school or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and, for purposes of part A of title V, includes a school of any agency of the United States.

(k) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 201. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in such institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$47,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, \$82,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, \$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or complete their education. Sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agreements between the Commissioner and institutions of higher education, for payment of Federal capital contributions which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan funds.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 202. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1962, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all of the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year ending after June 30, 1962, shall be allotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purpose for which such amounts are appropriated.

PAYMENT OF FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 203. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which institutions of higher education in a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions from the allotment of such State. In the event the total requested in such applications, which are made by institutions with which he has agreements under this title and which meet the requirements established in regulations of the Commissioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to the total requested in all such applications. In the event the total requested in such applications which are made by institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Commissioner may reallocate the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under section 202 for such year. The Federal capital contribution to an institution shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan fund established under its agreement under this title.

(b) In no case may the total of such Federal capital contributions to any institution of higher education for any fiscal year exceed \$250,000.

CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENTS

SEC. 204. An agreement with any institution of higher education for Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner under this title shall—

(1) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by such institution;

(2) provide for deposit in such fund of (A) the Federal capital contributions, (B) an amount, equal to not less than one-ninth of such Federal contributions, contributed by such institution, (C) collections of principal and interest on student loans made from such fund, and (D) any other earnings of the fund;

(3) provide that such student loan fund shall be used only for loans to students in accordance with such agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this title, and for costs of litigation arising in connection with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest on such loan;

(4) provide that in the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund special consideration shall be given to (A) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (B) students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language; and

(5) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this title and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the institution,

TERMS OF LOANS

SEC. 205. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year to any student made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed \$1,000, and

the total for all years to any student from such funds may not exceed \$5,000.

(b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by any institution of higher education shall be made on such terms and conditions as the institution may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the institution) with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of study; and except that—

(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate or graduate student;

(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount together with interest thereon, in equal annual installments, or, if the borrower so requests, in graduated periodic installments (determined in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner), over a period beginning one year after the date on which the borrower ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education and ending eleven years after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on any such loan, and periodic installments need not be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education, or (ii) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, (B) any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period during which the repayment must be completed, (C) such ten-year period may also be extended for good cause determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and (D) the borrower may at his option accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan;

(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school in a State, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each complete academic year of such service;

(4) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum except that no interest shall accrue before the date on which repayment of the loan is to begin;

(5) such a loan shall be made without security and without endorsement, except that, if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required;

(6) the liability to repay any such loan shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

(7) such a loan by an institution for any year shall be made in such installments as may be provided in regulations of the

Commissioner or the agreement with the institution under this title and, upon notice to the Commissioner by the institution that any recipient of a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld, as may be appropriate; and

(8) no note or other evidence of such a loan may be transferred or assigned by the institution of higher education making the loan except, upon the transfer of the borrower to another institution of higher education participating in the program under this title (or, if not participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by the Commissioner for such purpose), to such institution.

(c) An agreement under this title for payment of Federal capital contributions shall include provisions designed to make loans from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement reasonably available (to the extent of the available funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such institution in need thereof.

DISTRIBUTIONS OF ASSETS FROM STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

SEC. 206. (a) After June 30, 1966, and not later than September 30, 1966, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the student loan fund established under this title by each institution of higher education as follows:

(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1966, as the total amount of the Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Commissioner under this title bears to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the institution's capital contributions to such fund.

(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the institution.

(b) After September 30, 1966, each institution with which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this title shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the institution after June 30, 1966, in payment of principal or interest on student loans made from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of litigation incurred in collection of the principal or interest on loans from the fund and not already reimbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of principal or interest) as was determined for the Commissioner under subsection (a).

(c) Upon a finding by the institution or the Commissioner prior to July 1, 1966, that the liquid assets of a student loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this title exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the foreseeable future, and upon notice to such institution or to the Commissioner, as the case may be, there shall be, subject to such limitations as may be included in regulations of the Commissioner or in such agreement, a capital distribution from such fund. Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed as the Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner to the student loan fund prior to such distribution bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the capital contributions to the fund made by the institution.

(2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall be paid to the institution.

LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 207. (a) Upon application by any institution of higher education with which he has made an agreement under this title, the Commissioner may make a loan to such institution for the purpose of helping to finance the institution's capital contributions to a student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Any such loan may be made only if such institution shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this title. Loans made to institutions under this section shall bear interest at a rate which the Commissioner determines to be adequate to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this section, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, but not to exceed a total of \$25,000,000.

(c) Loans made by the Commissioner under this section shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Commissioner to be appropriate in each case, but not exceeding fifteen years.

PAYMENTS TO COVER REDUCTIONS IN AMOUNTS OF LOANS

SEC. 208. In addition to the payments otherwise authorized to be made pursuant to this title, the Commissioner shall pay to the appropriate institution, at such time or times as he determines, an amount which bears the same ratio to the interest which has been prevented from accruing and the portion of the principal which has been canceled on student loans pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 205 (b) (and not previously paid pursuant to this subsection) as the total amount of the institution's capital contributions to such fund under this title bears to the sum of such institution's capital contributions and the Federal capital contributions to such fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 209. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the other powers conferred upon him by this title, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this title and to compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title.

(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for (1) making payments to State educational agencies under this title for the acquisition of equipment (suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language) and for minor remodeling described in paragraph (1) of section 303 (a), and (2) making loans authorized in section 305. There are also authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agencies under this title to carry out the programs described in paragraph (5) of section 303 (a).

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 302. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 301 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008, and shall reserve 12 per centum for loans authorized in section 305. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

(A) the school-age population of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)),

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(2) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the continental United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum or more than $66\frac{2}{3}$ per centum. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1959, on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1960, and the second shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1962.

(3) For the purposes of this title—

(A) The term "child of school age" means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

(B) The term "continental United States" does not include Alaska.

(C) The term "income per child of school age" for any State or for the continental United States means the total personal income for the State and the continental United States, respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in such State and in the continental United States, respectively.

(4) A State's allotment under this subsection shall remain available for payment pursuant to section 304 (a) for projects in such State until the end of the fiscal year following the year for which the allotment is made.

(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the second sentence of section 301 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 303. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and—

(1) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 302 (a) will be expended solely for projects approved by the State educational agency for (A) acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audio-visual materials and equipment and printed materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language, in public elementary or secondary schools, or both, and (B) minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such materials or equipment;

(2) sets forth principles for determining the priority of such projects in the State for assistance under this title and provides for undertaking such projects, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

(3) provides an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency to any applicant for a project under this title;

(4) provides for the establishment of standards on a State level for laboratory and other special equipment acquired with assistance furnished under this title;

(5) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 302 (b) will be expended solely for (A) expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in public elementary and secondary schools in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and (B) administration of the State plan.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 304. (a) From a State's allotment for a fiscal year under section 302 (a), the Commissioner shall, from time to time during the period such allotment is available for payment as provided in paragraph (4) of section 302 (a), pay to such State an amount equal

to one-half of the expenditures for projects for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling referred to in paragraph (1) of section 303 (a) which are carried out under its State plan approved under section 303 (b); except that no State shall receive payments under this subsection for any period in excess of its allotments for such period under section 302 (a).

(b) From a State's allotment under section 302 (b) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner shall from time to time pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended by such State for such year to carry out the program referred to in paragraph (5) of section 303 (a) under its State plan approved under section 303 (b). From a State's allotment under section 302 (b) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal one-half of the amount so expended under its State plan approved under section 303 (b); except that no State shall receive payments under this subsection for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under section 302 (b) for that fiscal year.

LOANS TO NONPROFIT PRIVATE SCHOOLS

SEC. 305. (a) The Commissioner shall allot, out of funds reserved for each fiscal year for the purposes of this section under the provisions of section 302 (a), to each State for loans under the provisions of this section an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as the number of persons in such State enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools bears to the total of such numbers for all States.

(b) From the sums allotted to each State under the provisions of this section the Commissioner is authorized to make loans to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in such State for the purposes for which payments to State educational agencies are authorized under the first sentence of section 301. Any such loan—

(1) shall be made upon application containing such information as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioner;

(2) shall be subject to such conditions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

(3) shall bear interest at the rate arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the date the application for the loan is approved and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum; and

(4) shall mature and be repayable on such date as may be agreed to by the Commissioner and the borrower, but such date shall not be more than ten years after the date on which such loan was made.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 402. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner is authorized to award one thousand fellowships under the provisions of this title, and during each of the three succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award one thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellowships shall be for periods of study not in excess of three academic years.

AWARD OF FELLOWSHIPS AND APPROVAL OF INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioner shall award fellowships under this title to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by him under this section. The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding:

(1) that such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded,

(2) that such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation, and

(3) that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs preference will be given to persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education.

(b) The total of the fellowships awarded under this title for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program at any institution of higher education may not exceed a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the objective referred to in subsection (a) (2).

FELLOWSHIP STIPENDS

SEC. 404. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of \$2,000 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate degree, \$2,200 for the second such year, and \$2,400 for the third such year, plus an additional amount of \$400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study such amount not more than \$2,500 per academic year, as is determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the new graduate program or of the expansion in an existing graduate program in which such person is pursuing his course of study, which is reasonably attributable to him.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 405. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 404 only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities, approved by the Commissioner.

**TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING;
IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE
STUDENTS**

PART A—STATE PROGRAMS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 501. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making grants to State educational agencies under this part to assist them to establish and maintain programs of testing and guidance and counseling.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 502. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than \$20,000 shall be increased to \$20,000, the total of increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than \$20,000.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 503. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and sets forth—

(1) a program for testing students in the public secondary schools, and if authorized by law in other secondary schools, of such State to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and

(2) a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools of such State (A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (B) to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 504. (a) Payment under this part shall be made to those State educational agencies which administer plans approved under section 503. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, such payments shall equal the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal one-

half of the amount so expended; except that no State educational agency shall receive payment under this part for any fiscal year in excess of that State's allotment for that fiscal year as determined under section 502.

(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 503 and in which the State educational agency is not authorized by law to make payments to cover the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools in such State to determine student abilities and aptitudes, the Commissioner shall arrange for the testing of such students and shall pay the cost thereof for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and one-half of the cost thereof for any of the three succeeding fiscal years out of such State's allotment. Testing of students pursuant to this subsection shall, so far as practicable, be comparable to, and be done at the same grade levels and under the same conditions as in the case of, testing of students in public schools under the State plan.

PART B—COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE TRAINING INSTITUTES

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 511. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$6,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and \$7,250,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, by contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for the provision of training to improve the qualifications of personnel engaged in counseling and guidance of students in secondary schools, or teachers in such schools preparing to engage in such counseling and guidance. Each individual, engaged, or preparing to engage, in counseling and guidance in a public secondary school, who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance.

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

PART A—CENTERS AND RESEARCH AND STUDIES

LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS

SEC. 601. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, of centers for the teaching of any modern foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner determines (1) that individuals trained in such language are needed by the Federal Government or by business, industry, or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States. Any such contract may provide for instruction not only in such modern foreign language but also in other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used, to the extent adequate instruction in such fields is not readily available, including fields such as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology. Any such contract may cover not more than 50 per centum of

the cost of the establishment and operation of the center with respect to which it is made, including the cost of grants to the staff for travel in the foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject matter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working is concerned and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to such centers to teach or assist in teaching therein and the cost of their return, and shall be made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(b) The Commissioner is also authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals undergoing advanced training in any modern foreign language (with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a)), and other fields needed for a full understanding of the area, region, or country in which such language is commonly used, at any short-term or regular session of any institution of higher education, including allowances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of residence, but only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients of such stipends will, on completion of their training, be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an institution of higher education or for such other service of a public nature as may be permitted in regulations of the Commissioner.

RESEARCH AND STUDIES

SEC. 602. The Commissioner is authorized, directly or by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages and other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in such training, or in training teachers of such languages or in such fields.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 603. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part, not to exceed \$8,000,000 in any one fiscal year.

PART B—LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 611. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$7,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advance training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign language in elementary or secondary schools. Each individual (engaged, or preparing to engage, in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign language in a public elementary or secondary school) who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of \$75 per week for the period of his

attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of \$15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

PART A—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSIONER

SEC. 701. In carrying out the provisions of this part the Commissioner, in cooperation with the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media (established by section 761), shall (through grants or contracts) conduct, assist, and foster research and experimentation in the development and evaluation of projects involving television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication which may prove of value to State or local educational agencies in the operation of their public elementary or secondary schools, and to institutions of higher education, including the development of new and more effective techniques and methods—

(1) for utilizing and adapting motion pictures, video tapes and other audio-visual aids, film strips, slides and other visual aids, recordings (including magnetic tapes) and other auditory aids, and radio or television program scripts for such purposes;

(2) for training teachers to utilize such media with maximum effectiveness; and

(3) for presenting academic subject matter through such media.

GRANTS-IN-AID; CONTRACTS

SEC. 702. In carrying out the provisions of section 701, the Commissioner—

(1) may make grants-in-aid, approved by the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and individuals for projects of research or experimentation referred to in section 701;

(2) may enter into contracts, approved by the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, with public or private agencies, organizations, groups, and individuals for projects of research or experimentation referred to in section 701; and

(3) shall promote the coordination of programs conducted or financed by him under this title with similar programs conducted by other agencies, institutions, foundations, organizations, or individuals.

PART B—DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON NEW EDUCATIONAL MEDIA

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSIONER

SEC. 731. In order to disseminate information concerning new educational media (including the results of research and experimentation conducted under part A of this title) to State or local educational agencies, for use in their public elementary or secondary schools, and to institutions of higher education, the Commissioner—

(1) shall make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved utilization of television, radio, motion pic-

tures, and related media of communication by State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education for educational purposes;

(2) shall prepare and publish catalogs, reviews, bibliographies, abstracts, analyses of research and experimentation, and such other materials as are generally useful in the encouragement and more effective use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication for educational purposes;

(3) may, upon request, provide advice, counsel, technical assistance, and demonstrations to State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize such media of communication to increase the quality or depth or broaden the scope of their educational programs;

(4) shall prepare and publish an annual report setting forth (A) projects carried out under this title and the cost of each such project, and (B) developments in the utilization and adaptation of media of communication for educational purposes; and

(5) may enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals to carry out the provisions of this part.

PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 761. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on New Educational Media (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Advisory Committee"). The Advisory Committee shall consist of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, a representative of the National Science Foundation and twelve persons appointed, without regard to the civil-service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Three of such appointed members shall be individuals identified with the sciences, liberal arts, or modern foreign languages in institutions of higher education; three shall be individuals actually engaged in teaching or in the supervision of teaching in elementary or secondary schools; three shall be individuals of demonstrated ability in the utilization or adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication for educational purposes; and three shall be individuals representative of the lay public who have demonstrated an interest in the problems of communication media.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall—

(1) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Commissioner on matters relating to the utilization or adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, or related media of communication for educational purposes, and on matters of basic policy arising in the administration of this title;

(2) review all applications for grants-in-aid under part A of this title for projects of research or experimentation and certify approval to the Commissioner of any such projects which it believes are appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title; and

(3) review all proposals by the Commissioner to enter into contracts under this title and certify approval to the Commissioner of any such contracts which it believes are appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

(c) The Commissioner may utilize the services of any member or members of the Advisory Committee in connection with matters relating to the provisions of this title, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

(d) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on business of the Advisory Committee or at the request of the Commissioner under subsection (c) of this section, receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, not to exceed \$50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

SPECIAL PERSONNEL

Sec. 762. The Commissioner may secure from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, without regard to the civil-service laws, the assistance and advice of persons in the United States and from abroad who are experts in the utilization and adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, and other related media of communication for educational purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 763. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the sum of \$5,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of this title.

TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

39 Stat. 929.
20 USC 11-15,
16-28.
60 Stat. 775.
20 USC 15i note.

SEC. 801. The Congress hereby finds that the excellent programs of vocational education, which States have established and are carrying on with the assistance provided by the Federal Government under the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (the George-Barden Act), need extension to provide vocational education to residents of areas inadequately served and also to meet national defense requirements for personnel equipped to render skilled assistance in fields particularly affected by scientific and technological developments. It is therefore the purpose of this title to provide assistance to the States that they may improve their vocational education programs through area vocational education programs approved by State boards of vocational education as providing vocational and related technical training and retraining for youths, adults, and older persons, including related instruction for apprentices, designed to fit them for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in scientific or technical fields.

AMENDMENT TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946

SEC. 802. The Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15i-15m, 15o-15q, 15aa-15jj) is amended by adding after title II the following new title:

"TITLE III—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 301. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years the sum of \$15,000,000 for area vocational education programs, to be apportioned for expenditure in the States as provided in section 302.

"ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 301, each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the total of the amounts apportioned under title I of this Act, the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31-33), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U. S. C. 34), to such State for such year bears to the total of the amounts so apportioned to all the States for such year.

"(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State certifies to the Commissioner will not be required for carrying out area vocational education programs (under the part of the State plan meeting the requirements of section 305) shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year. Any amount so reallocated to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a).

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 303. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 302 for any fiscal year shall be paid on condition:

"(1) that there shall be spent for such year an equal amount in State or local funds, or both, for area vocational education programs operated under the provisions of this title;

"(2) that funds appropriated under this title will not be used to reduce the amount of State or local funds, or both, being spent for vocational education programs operated under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I and II of this Act and reported to the Commissioner, but such State or local funds, or both, in excess of the amount necessary for dollar for dollar matching of funds allotted to a State under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I and II of this Act may be used to match funds appropriated under this title;

39 Stat. 929.
20 USC 11-15,
16-28.

"(3) that funds appropriated under section 301 of this title shall be used exclusively for the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge, as determined by the State board for such State, in fields necessary for the national defense.

"(b) The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State for area vocational education programs under this title for such period; and shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this subsection) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for any prior period

for such purpose under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under this title for such purpose. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine.

"USE OF FUNDS

"SEC. 304. (a) Funds paid to a State under this title for area vocational education programs may be used, in carrying out such programs (under the part of the State plan meeting the requirements of section 305), for—

"(1) maintenance of adequate programs of administration, supervision, and teacher-training;

"(2) salaries and necessary travel expenses of State or local school personnel, including teachers, coordinators, supervisors, vocational guidance counselors, teacher-trainers, directors, administrators, and others;

"(3) travel expenses of members of advisory committees or State boards;

"(4) purchase, rental, or other acquisition, and maintenance and repair, of instructional equipment;

"(5) purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids;

"(6) necessary costs of transportation of students;

"(7) securing necessary educational information and data as a basis for the proper development of area vocational education programs and programs of vocational guidance;

"(8) training and work-experience training programs for out-of-school youths;

"(9) related instruction for apprentices; and

"(10) determining the need for, and planning and developing, area vocational education programs.

"(b) Any equipment and teaching aids purchased with funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title shall become the property of the State.

"ADDITIONAL STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 305. (a) To be eligible to participate in this title the State plan must be amended to include a new part which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of such part of the plan (or for the supervision of the administration thereof by State or local educational agencies);

"(2) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors and others having responsibilities under the plan;

"(3) shows the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out such part of the State plan;

"(4) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of such part of the State plan; and

"(5) provides that the State board will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this title.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve a part of any plan for purposes of this title if he finds that it fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board finds that—

"(1) the part of the State plan approved under subsection (b) has been so changed that it no longer complies with any provision required by subsection (a) of this section to be included in such part; or

"(2) in the administration of such part of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision; the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State from its allotments under section 302 (or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for projects under or portions of such part of the State plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State from its allotments under section 302 (or shall limit payments to projects under or portions of such part of the State plan in which there is no such failure).

"(d) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action under subsection (c) of this section, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 306. There are hereby authorized to be included for each fiscal year in the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as are necessary to administer the provisions of this title.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 307. For purposes of this title—

"(a) The term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and Guam.

"(b) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(c) The terms 'State plan' and 'State board' shall have the meaning which said terms have in the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114).

"(d) The term 'area vocational education program' means a program consisting of one or more less-than-college-grade courses conducted under public supervision and control and on an organized, systematic class basis, which is designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in recognized occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge, and which is made

20 USC 11-15,
16-28.

available to residents of the State or an area thereof designated and approved by the State board, who either have completed junior high school or, regardless of their school credits, are at least sixteen years of age and can reasonably be expected to profit by the instruction offered."

TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

FUNCTIONS OF THE SERVICE

SEC. 901. The National Science Foundation shall establish a Science Information Service. The Foundation, through such Service, shall (1) provide, or arrange for the provision of, indexing, abstracting, translating, and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information, and (2) undertake programs to develop new or improved methods, including mechanized systems, for making scientific information available.

SCIENCE INFORMATION COUNCIL

SEC. 902. (a) The National Science Foundation shall establish, in the Foundation, a Science Information Council (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Council") consisting of the Librarian of Congress, the director of the National Library of Medicine, the director of the Department of Agriculture library, and the head of the Science Information Service, each of whom shall be ex officio members, and fifteen members appointed by the Director of the National Science Foundation. The Council shall annually elect one of the appointed members to serve as chairman until the next election. Six of the appointed members shall be leaders in the fields of fundamental science, six shall be leaders in the fields of librarianship and scientific documentation, and three shall be outstanding representatives of the lay public who have demonstrated interest in the problems of communication. Each appointed member of such Council shall hold office for a term of four years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term, and (2) that of the members first appointed, four shall hold office for a term of three years, four shall hold office for a term of two years, and three shall hold office for a term of one year, as designated by the Director of the National Science Foundation at the time of appointment. No appointed member of the Council shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Council to advise, to consult with, and to make recommendations to, the head of the Science Information Service. The Council shall meet at least twice each year, and at such other times as the majority thereof deems appropriate.

(c) Persons appointed to the Council shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at rates fixed by the National Science Foundation, but not to exceed \$50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

SEC. 903. In carrying out its functions under this title, the National Science Foundation shall have the same power and authority it has under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to carry out its functions under that Act.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 904. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 1001. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the titles of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U. S. C., sec. 5), of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

(c) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the activities of the Office of Education under this Act, including recommendations for needed revisions in the provisions thereof.

(d) The Secretary shall advise and consult with the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs with a view to securing full information concerning all specialized scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs administered by or under any such department or agency and to developing policies and procedures which will strengthen the educational programs and objectives of the institutions of higher education utilized for such purposes by any such department or agency.

(e) Any agency of the Federal Government shall exercise its functions under any other law in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding or limiting the authority of any such agency under any other law.

(f) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 1002. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may appoint an advisory committee, or advisory committees, to advise and consult with him with respect to the administration of the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible. Any such committee shall have twelve members as follows:

- (1) Four members who are recognized scholars in any of the following fields: engineering, mathematics, or science;
- (2) Four members who are recognized scholars in any of the fields of the humanities; and
- (3) Four members from such fields of endeavor as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

Members of an advisory committee appointed under this section, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$50 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

EXEMPTION FROM CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST LAWS OF MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES OR INFORMATION COUNCIL

SEC. 1003. (a) Any member of an advisory committee or information council appointed under this Act is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The exemption granted by subsection (a) shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

(2) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 1004. (a) No State plan submitted under one of the titles of this Act shall be approved by the Commissioner which does not—

(1) provide, in the case of a plan submitted under title III or under title V, or section 1009 of this title, that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(2) provide that such commission or agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under such title or section; and

(3) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under such title or section.

(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof without first affording the agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the agency administering a State plan approved under one of the titles of this Act, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this Act governing its original approval, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency, in the case of a plan submitted under title III or V or section 1009 of this title, that no further payments will be made to the State under such title or section (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under such title or section, as the case may be (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 1005. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this Act, or with respect to his final action under section 1004), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, in the United States district court for the district in which the capital of the State is located, a petition to review such action. The petition for review shall (1) contain a concise statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based and (2) designate that part of the Commissioner's decision sought to be reviewed.

(b) Notification of the filing of the petition for review shall be given by the clerk of the court by mailing a copy of the petition to the Commissioner.

(c) No costs or docket fees shall be charged or imposed with respect to any judicial review proceedings, or appeal therefrom, taken under this Act.

(d) Upon receipt of the petition for review the Commissioner shall, within twenty days thereafter, certify and file in the court the record on review, consisting of the complete transcript of the proceedings before the Commissioner. No party to such review shall be required, by rule of court or otherwise, to print the contents of such record filed in the court.

(e) The court after review may dismiss the petition or deny the relief prayed for, or may suspend, modify, or set aside, in whole or in part, the action of the Commissioner, or may compel action unlawfully withheld. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review provided in section 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

METHOD OF PAYMENT

SEC. 1006. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant, loan, or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of grants or loans, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 1007. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for Appropriations. the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act, including the administrative expenses of State commissions.

ALLOTMENTS TO TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

SEC. 1008. The amounts reserved by the Commissioner under sections 302 and 502 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs for the type of assistance furnished under the part or title in which the section appears.

IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES OF STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

SEC. 1009. (a) For the purpose of assisting the States to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of educational statistics provided by State and local reports and records and the methods and techniques for collecting and processing educational data and disseminating information about the condition and progress of education in the States, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for grants to States under this section, such sums as the Congress may determine.

Grants.

(b) Grants under this section by the Commissioner shall be equal to one-half of the cost of State educational agency programs to carry out the purposes of this section, including (1) improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of statistical data supplied by local educational units, (2) the development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve as guides for local educational units, (3) the conduct of conferences and training for personnel of local educational units and of periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for records and reports, (4) improving methods for obtaining, from other State agencies within the State, educational data not collected by the State educational agency, or (5) expediting the processing and reporting of statistical data through installation and operation of mechanical equipment. The total of the payments to any State under this section for any fiscal year may not exceed \$50,000.

Restriction.

(c) Payments with respect to any program of a State educational agency under this section may be made (1) only to the extent it is a new program or an addition to or expansion of an existing program, and (2) only if the State plan approved under subsection (d) includes such program.

(d) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for purposes of this section if such plan meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and sets forth the programs proposed to be carried out under the plan and the general policies to be followed in doing so.

Approved September 2, 1958.

243 ¶ Statement by the President Upon Signing
the National Defense Education Act.

September 2, 1958

I HAVE TODAY signed into law H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act.

This Act, which is an emergency undertaking to be terminated after four years, will in that time do much to strengthen our American system of education so that it can meet the broad and increasing demands imposed upon it by considerations of basic national security.

While the Congress did not see fit to provide a limited number of National Defense scholarships which I recommended as an incentive to our most promising youth, I consider this Act to be a sound and constructive piece of legislation.

Much remains to be done to bring American education to levels consistent with the needs of our society. The Federal government having done its share, the people of the country, working through their local and State governments and through private agencies, must now redouble their efforts toward this end.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

NOTE: As enacted, H. R. 13247 is Public Law 85-864 (72 Stat. 1580).

This statement was released at the U. S. Naval Base, Newport, R. I.

244 ¶ Statement by the President Upon Signing
the Public Works Appropriation Act.

September 2, 1958

IN THE PUBLIC WORKS Appropriation Act, 1959, the Congress has included approximately \$39 million in funds to initiate construction on 65 unbudgeted new project starts that will ultimately cost almost \$700 million. Adding nearly \$700 million to the already heavy future commitments for Federal water resources projects is but another instance of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds. I am compelled to approve the Act, however, because it appropriates essential funds for

